THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 4 DECEMBER VOL. XLV

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

LORD HORDER: SCIENTIFIC MEDICINE AND POSTERITY

With the death of Lord Horder, G.C.V.O., M.D., British civilization has lost a G.P. in the widest sense of that term. The British nation from the highest to the lowest was his patient, and not only the contemporary nation but the nation yet to be. In his book *Fifty Years of Medicine* (1953) Lord Horder emphasizes that primarily he is a Humanist, not a humanitarian, a Eugenist, not an economic socialist. He explains his function thus:

> 'In the view of the eugenist—a view which I share with utter conviction—the economic advantages, using the term in its widest sense, lie with efforts made towards racial betterment rather than with social service in a particular generation' (p. 51).

For Horder medical science was dominantly progressive—one of the greatest factors in a beneficial human evolution. Of its present phase of advance he writes:

> 'Basically considered, what are the main phases by which the control of disease has passed during the last half century? They have been three. At first the phase was . . . in the sphere of chemistry and physics. Then it became biological. The third phase is psychological and this we have scarcely yet explored. These phases overlap. We are still in the biological sphere, where we remain hesitant, or are actually obstructive . . .
>
> The voluntary sterilization of the carriers of hereditable disease still lack effective support. As President of the Eugenics Society I was actively interested in trying to get a sanction in this matter on the Statute Book. We are more and more often consulted by intelligent young folk who are willing, indeed anxious, that this should be done, but an ancient law about maiming the citizen could be so interpreted that

an action might still lie against the doctor who undertook the operation, and this despite a written request by both parties to a marriage, even if backed by a similar sanction from their parents' (p. 59).

As a eugenist Horder was an unflinching supporter of birth-control, the limitation in the size of families, the spacing of children, the use of contraceptives prohibied by Roman Catholicism and viewed askance by many who are not of that religion. Of it he writes :

'Who knows better than the family doctor the dysgenic effects of Mrs. Smith's rapidly repeated confinements both on herself and on her children? But the teaching of, and facilities for, contraception, by which a mother may space her childbirths, are, even to-day, only supported, as it were *sotto voce*, by the profession' (p. 54).

It has been left in no little degree to the heroic Dr. Marie Stopes, a doctor of science (not a doctor of medicine), to educate national opinion both as to the need for and best methods of such birth control.

An increasingly important need for birth control was emphasized by Lord Simon of Wythenshawe in *The Times* of October 29.

India has recognized in her five-year plan that real success in raising standards of living can hardly be expected until the number of births is reduced. The Indian Government, is I think, the first in history to devote a large sum (£500,000) in the first five-year plan towards the beginning of an effective family planning campaign. And Mr. Nehru is the first Prime Minister in the world to have said that his country would be better off if she had half her present population.

It is encouraging that the recent international conference in Singapore has decided to continue the Colombo plan for four years after June, 1957, and to increase the resources available. But the Colombo plan cannot hope to have an appreciable effect on standards of living so long as there is an annual increase of nearly five million persons in India, and at least another five million in the other Colombo plan countries. It is to be hoped that India will be successful in her efforts to introduce family planning and that other South-east Asian countries will follow her example in this matter.

May I venture to call the attention of your readers to the fundamental importance of this question of increase of population not only in South-east Asia but in many other parts of the world, and express the hope that we may soon see the end of what has been called the 'conspiracy of silence' on this question of the regulation of population?

SIMON OF WYTHENSHAWE

Broomcroft, Didsbury, Manchester 20

Horder was strongly against voluntary euthanasia and opposed it on more than one occasion in Parliament and for two very practical reasons.

(1) 'The disease which is thought to be incurable to-day is curable to-morrow' (p. 59).

(2) The means for alleviating pain have greatly increased and the limit is not yet reached. Horder emphasizes in this connection that it is the function of the physician to cure disease and to alleviate pain but not to shorten human life.

Horder in his medical mission to the nation strongly supported cremation, noise abatement and smoke abatements as enemies of national health. Horder's supremely scientific conception of the methods and scope of medical practice seeks in many unforeseen ways to fulfil the Christian ideal : *servire est regnare*.

South India : Intercommunion Achieved

The Archbishop of Canterbury is to be congratulated on having at last secured intercommunion with the Church of South India based on the recognition by the Canterbury Convocation that the bishops, presbyters and deacons of the recently constituted Church of South India are 'true bishops, priests, and deacons in the Church of God'.

The Catholic development of the C.S.I. during the last five years, the Primate claimed, justifies inter-communion, and it is this conviction which has in the last resort won our hesitant Anglo-Catholics to support Dr. Fisher's policy and patience; since they are assured that this intercommunion involves 'no abandoning of our Catholic Heritage'. (See *Church Times*, October 14, page 13.)

We need not here discuss the significance of the phrase 'Catholic Heritage' which is differently understood by Anglo-Catholics, Evangelicals and Liberals. But if it includes the retention by the Church of England of its Three-Fold ministry, the Two Great Sacraments, the right of Final Appeal to the Holy Scriptures in the spheres of Christian faith and doctrine, we are all agreed. This decision of intercommunion with the C.S.I. not only unites us with the members of that Church but should bring us all into closer fellowship with one another throughout the whole Anglican Communion.

The threat that a large secession of Anglican clergy to Rome would be caused by inter-communion with C.S.I., has proved itself to be farcically groundless : the number of secessionists to date is said to be four.

Spiritual Freedom and Ecclesiastical Legalism

The Christian Church is essentially a Fellowship of Christians inspired by the Holy Spirit of which each and all are under an obligation to advance the Coming of the Kingdon of God on earth. In the teaching of Jesus prophetic inspiration for the guidance of

Christians is basically preserved in the Lord's Prayer, the Two Great Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount and the Parables of the Kingdom, but with no legal regulations—spiritual and moral evolution constitutes the basis of Christian fellowship and order.

In Christ's time the Jewish Religion was dominantly legal: Christ's apostles were all Jews: the first church in Jerusalem was dominantly Jewish in membership but this situation was changed when the Pauline Missions converted large numbers of Gentiles to the Christian Faith. Jewish Christians demanded that these converts must be circumcised and keep the Jewish law: St. Paul opposed this in the name of Christian freedom and his *Epistle to the Galatians* voices this demand with the most unflinching emphasis.

> 'With freedom did Christ set us free: stand fast therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage' (*Gal.* v, 1).

As a result of this legalist controversy the First Council of the Christian Church was assembled in Jerusalem and produced a code of church canons contained in one verse (*Acts* xv, 20) which it transmitted in a brief Epistle to the Gentile churches claiming significantly as the authority for their action: 'It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than *these necessary things*' (*Acts* xv, 28).

The Decision of Princess Margaret

In the four 'necessary things' included in the earliest Code of Canons of the Primitive Christian Church circulated in the Apostolic Epistle (*Acts* xv, 29) referred to in the above Signs of the Times, one of the four 'necessary things' is *porneia*. The term *porneia* has at least seven different meanings as Dr. R. H. Charles points out in his treatise on the word. (*Mt.* v, 32; xix, 9; *Acts*, xv, 20, 29; xxi, 25.) One of these meanings is 'marriage within prohibited degrees'. These marriages, prohibited by first century Jewish custom, the Apostolic Epistle urges should not be contracted by Gentile Christians if Christian Fellowship between Jewish Christian converts and Gentile Christian converts is to be maintained. This kind of marriage union, the Apostolic Epistle does not forbid as unchristian, but urges that it is a kind of union from which, in the existing church situation, Gentile Christians should abstain.

Recent public controversy concerning the Princess Margaret's decision not to contract marriage with Group Captain Peter Townsend seems to us to deal with a parallel situation in our

modern Christian world. This decision was published on October 31 and runs as follows :

> 'Mindful of the Church's teaching that Christian Marriage is indissoluble and conscious of my duty to the Commonwealth, I have resolved to put these considerations before any others' and 'have decided not to marry Group Captain Peter Townsend.'

This decision has evoked profound relief in political and ecclesiastical circles.

The Times of November 1 under the heading Church Comments published the following statement :

> The Rev. Clifford O. Rhodes, director and secretary of the Modern Churchmen's Union, and editor of the *Church of England Newspaper,* described the Princess's statement as 'a very remarkable one.'
>
> 'I am sure that Princess Margaret's announcement will give very great pleasure, and will greatly enhance the respect in which she is held,' he added. 'She has proved herself a real leader, and has shown herself worthy of the great traditions which she serves.
>
> 'Those of us who do not entirely agree with the statement as to the indissolubility of marriage will still feel that from every standpoint the Princess's decision is the right one. Far more was involved in her decision than a point of ecclesiastical law.'

The *Birmingham Mail* (October 21) published the following statement by the Rev. Norman Power, the Vicar of Ladywood, Birmingham, which we Liberal Churchmen hold to be as loyal to the Christian Faith and Christian spirit as it is loyal to the legal comprehensiveness of the Church of England.

> 'For obvious reasons, I have received a large number of letters in the last few days asking me whether it is legally possible for an innocent party after a divorce to be married in a Church of England church.
>
> The answer is "Yes." In enlarging upon this, I must explain that I am giving you my own views. The Church of England allows wide differences of view. Some may regret this, wishing we had a rigid "party line." Personally, I believe that our freedom is something to cherish and in which to glory. On this question, I deeply respect the principles of those who would disagree with this article, but I am free to state my own views.
>
> In this matter, the law of England, by which our National Church is bound, allows a clergyman to use his own discretion.
>
> Under the Act of 1857, a clergyman was under a legal obligation to solemnize the marriage of an "innocent party" if so requested. He could not be compelled to do this for a guilty party. Bishop Tait of London (and later Archbishop of Canterbury) expressed the view that this decision was right.
>
> The position was amended by the "Herbert Act" of 1937. This enacted that a clergyman could not be compelled against his conscience to solemnize the marriage of an "innocent party," or to allow his church to be used for this purpose. It permitted him, however, to solemnize such a marriage if his conscience allowed him to do so.
>
> That is the legal position today, and that is why the answer I give is "Yes."

The matter is thus left by law to the pastoral and priestly discretion of the individual minister, who alone knows the circumstances. In my view, that is as it should be . . .

One of the proposed 'canons' (Church laws) now under discussion —but not yet, thank God, the law of the land—would deprive the clergy of their pastoral discretion in this matter.

Many of us feel that this descretion is a sacred trust, especially precious in these days of increasing authoritarianism and centralization. We feel that in defending it we are "standing fast in the liberty with which Christ has set us free," who brought release from "the bondage of the law." We are also defending our legal rights—and yours.

Now, briefly, may I give the reasons for the opinion held by myself and many other clergy?

In St. Mark's Gospel, Jesus upheld the ideal of lifelong love and loyalty in marriage, which we must all do all we can to uphold. He did this when King Herod's example was a national scandal and John the Baptist had been killed for saying so.

But Jesus was upholding an ideal—not legislating. This was typical, for He was speaking for all time and every place; also He never excluded compassion and charity.

Thus, in St. Matthew's Gospel, we find a concession made and divorce allowed (*Matt.* v, 32 : xix, 9).

This shows that the first Christians knew that Jesus was not legislating when He upheld the ideal of lifelong loyalty. St. Paul knew this. He taught that a deserted Christian husband or wife could remarry (*I Cor.* vii, 15).

In the days of the "fathers" of the Church, divorce and the right to remarry were allowed widely for grave causes, though the ideal was always upheld.

The great archbishops and bishops of the Church of England have allowed the clergy to use their discretion in this matter. Among them we find Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln, Bishop Edward King of Lincoln, Archbishop Randall Davidson and Archbishop Frederick Temple.

We find this freedom upheld, although he believed divorce a most terrible tragedy, by Bishop Edward Hall (1574-1656)—"I dare not ensnare those whom God will have free"—and Bishop Mandell Creighton cites Cranmer, Andrewes and Laud in maintaining the same view.

Dr. Mandell Creighton (Bishop of London) was a most important authority, a great divine and a great historian. He wrote:

> "We, as Christians, abhor divorce, but when a divorce has been judged necessary, are we to refuse any liberty to the innocent or wronged party? I could not advise any of my clergy to refuse to solemnize a marriage of an innocent party who genuinely desired God's blessing. I prefer to err on the side of charity."

I pray God that the leaders of the Church will remember those words to-day !

Clergy—and they are many—who think as I do are often exhorted to be loyal to the Church. I believe such loyalty is due to the glorious tradition of our Church as a whole, in its charity and its freedom.

Many of us, who know the personal tragedies that lie behind requests to solemnize the marriage of an "innocent party," and the depth of sincere longing for a chance to remake a broken life, are utterly convinced that Jesus would have us uphold his ideal—but not to the exclusion of compassion and charity. These qualities are at the heart of

Christ's teaching. I believe that if we reject them we reject Him. With Dr. Mandell Chreighton, if I do err in this opinion, I prefer to "err on the side of charity."'

Mr. Power's statement where it concerns the rights of the parochial clergy was supplemented in the *Sunday Dispatch* of October 23 by the Rev. Bryan Green, Rector of Birmingham, who possesses a world-wide reputation as a Christian Evangelist.

'As to the legal position from the point of view of the Church of England there is no doubt. Any parish priest can legally and, at the moment, morally marry any innocent party to a divorce in his church if one of the parties lives in his parish.

This is clearly implied in Sir Alan Herbert's Act of 1937. This Act, by the way, passed the House of Lords with some bishops consenting to it.

If, therefore, I decided it was right to marry an innocent party in my church no one could prevent me. The regulations of a bishop are not legally binding nor are the resolutions of Convocation.

Morally binding they may or may not be, but our Church of England has always stood in the last analysis for the liberty of the individual conscience.'

Laity and Liberty in the C. of E.

A significant brochure assessing the revision up to date of the Canons of 1603-4 has just been issued under the title of *Canon Law in the Church of England*.[1]

It consists of seven essays: *Introductory Survey*, by the Rev. E. Hughes, M.A., B.D. *Canon Law and Christian Reunion*, by the Rev. E. C. Dewick, D.D. *The position of the Laity in the Church*, by C. W. Finney, Esq., M.Inst., M.I.R.T.E. *The Vesture of Ministers*, by the Rev. Richard J. Coates, *Implications of the Marriage Canons*, by the Very Rev. J. Howard Cruse, M.A. *Lawful Authority and the Ecclesiastical Courts*, by J. F. Wallace, Esq., LL.B. *The Doctrine of the Church and Holy Scripture*, by the Rev. M. Guthrie Clark, M.A.

Its contributors are devoted Churchmen of wide experience: special value is due to the fact that two of them are laymen, both of them members of the House of Laity. With the exception of Provost Cruse and Dr. Dewick, who are Liberals, the standpoint of the five other contributors is Evangelical.

In 1939, six years before Dr. Fisher became Primate, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York appointed a Commission to investigate and report on Canon Law. Eight years later in 1947 the Report of this Commission, which included a complete set

[1] *Canon Law and the Church of England*. An examination of the present revision, edited by Philip E. Hughes. (Published on behalf of the Church Society, 7 Wine Office Court, E.C., 1955; 4/6.)

of new draft canons, was published. The Convocations discussed the Report during the next eight years and are still engaged in discussion. The Canons of 1603-4, numbering 143, sanctioned by the Convocations of Canterbury and York and authorized by James I but not legalised by Parliament and so possessing no legal authority over the laity, and dubious authority for the clergy, have in the new draft been reduced to 134 canons.

It is intended that these draft canons, when their examination and revision is completed, shall ultimately be authorised by the authorities in Church and State for the obedience of the members of the Church of England from the Archbishop of Canterbury down to the humblest layman holding any office whatsoever in the Church or desiring the Church's ministrations. The alleged purpose of this revolutionary policy is to set the Church's house in order but the question is being very seriously asked: Is not the project proving itself to be much too dangerous and much too difficult to make it worth while to carry on with the revision?

In 1902 Canterbury Convocation set up a joint committee to investigate the place and duties of the laity in the Church of England. The committee consisted of 'seven Bishops, three Deans, four Archdeacons, five Canons and one Prebendary, but not one solitary layman' (p. 18). Nothwithstanding this omission the committee produced a valuable source of information which thanks to the iniative of Mr. Goyder, the Evangelical champion of the rights of the laity, was republished in 1952 by the S.P.C.K.

Canon Law as it concerns the Church of England to-day came into practical existence with the *Act for the submission of the Clergy* and its sister *The ecclesiastical appointments Act* of the same year (1533) which transferred, or as some would claim, restored to the sovereign the Imperial authority usurped over our national Church by the Roman Pope.

The *Toleration Act* of 1688 and many subsequent enactments, political, civic and educational, conceived in the same English spirit progressively extending religious liberty and equality, have not deprived the House of Commons of its fundamental loyalty to the essential religious ideals which achieved vitality and expression in the great Reformation and Revolution epochs of our English national evolution.

This conviction that the House of Commons to-day is not less loyal but possibly even more loyal to the ideals of Christian freedom, truth and fellowship than in any preceding period of our history justifies retention of Parliament as the most reliable organ for voicing the verdict of the English laity especially in periods of ecclesiastical conflict and rivalry.

In brief, the decisions of the Prime Minister, representing the English democracy, and where supported in legal issues by the Lord Chancellor, 'the Keeper of the King's conscience', have proved themselves able to express the profoundest national religious convictions even when our bishops were in conflict with them. Furthermore, the legal decisions of the judicial Committee of the Privy Council in Causes Ecclesiastical have shown themselves to possess a prophetic as well as a representative national foresight. But, as it seems to us, *it is this lay representation in the life of the Church of England which our contemporary Church policy of canonical revision aims at eliminating* and not least when it seeks to re-create an ecclesiastical Court of High Commission presided over by the Primate to replace the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in Causes Ecclesiastical.

The House of Laity in the Church Assembly is powerless when involved in a conflict with prelacy. This is not only due to the House of Laity possessing no official rights in the spheres of doctrine and worship but is also due to it not being as really representative of English lay religious feeling as is the House of Commons when it comes to voicing effectively a national religious decision.

But it will be asked: How then are we to secure order and unity in the Church of England? We answer: not by revising our out-of date canons of 1603; nor, we would add, by imitating the Church of Scotland. The Church of Scotland is with negligible exceptions one religious body but the Church of England is 'three religions under one roof'. To retain its national comprehensiveness the Church of England must recognize this fact.

To-day in practice, the Church has virtually abandoned rigid legal Uniformity in worship and in doctrine. What the Church now needs is to develop in its stead an organic, evolutional Unity held together by the Spirit of comprehensive Christian Fellowship united to modern Christian education and sympathetic episcopal administraion—given to hospitality.

Dr. Dewick's Queries and Misgivings

Dr. Dewick, Hulsean prize man and D.D. Cambridge, who has been the Principal of at least four Theological Colleges beginning with St. Aidan's, and has had wide educational experience in India as Fellow of Calcutta University and Canon of Nagpur, is much concerned with our long-drawn-out Canonical revision as it affects ordinands and Reunion, at home and abroad.

In his Essay 'Canon Law and Christian Reunion', published

in *Canon Law and the Church of England*,[2] his queries and misgivings are briefly summarised. The son of a learned Tractarian clergyman, who enriched the British museum with liturgical treasures, later supplemented by his son, asserts that

> 'He never heard Canon Law mentioned in his home; and at his Ordination, while he was called upon to assent explicitly to the Book of Common Prayer and the Articles, neither the bishop nor the examining chaplains ever suggested that he was also bound by Canon Law' (p. 9).

This was the general experience of Anglican ordinands. The present writer of these notes, who had to learn the XXXIX Articles by heart in English critically compared with their Latin parallels, and authorized by 'Scripture Proofs', found no reference in them to Canon Law and its obligations. When later, as Principal of a Theological College, he wished to place for reference a copy of the Canons of 1603-4 in the chapel, he searched many old English Prayer books with the hope of finding a copy of the Canons included in them; but he found none, although he did find in one Prayer Book the Service of *Touching for the King's Evil*, which was not practised after the death of Queen Anne. But his search for the Canons was not unrewarded. At last he found them as a supplement in a volume containing the Two Books of Homilies composed in Tudor times.

These personal experiences reflect the general lack of influence of the Canons of 1603 on our English Church life: they have been dead and buried for centuries. How are we to account for their resurrection to-day?

Dr. Dewick regards this resurrection as an Anglo-Catholic achievement aimed at ultimately securing the triumph of Anglo-Catholicism in the Church of England under the cloak of establishing order in the Church. He points out that the Commission engaged in revising the Canons of 1603 is dominantly Anglo-Catholic.

> 'It is significant that among the members of the Commission which drew up these Canons, there is not a single representative (with one possible exception) of definite Evangelical or Liberal Churchmanship, while there are four or five who are recognized exponents of advanced Anglo-Catholicism. It is not surprising, therefore, that among the changes proposed in the Canons, there is hardly one which shews any sympathy with (or even any awareness of) either the basic principles of the Reformation, or the challenge of present-day Christian thought to the Church.
>
> If the proposed Canons are compared with (say) the Constitution of the Church of South India, the contrast in spirit between the two becomes evident. The latter, while recognizing the authority of the Scriptures, and the main tradition of Christendom, is elastic and "alive",

[2] Published 7 Wine Office Court, E.C.4, 1955; 6/-.

leaving a door open for the Church to listen to what the Spirit may say in the days ahead, and entrusting to the *whole* Church (bishops, clergy, and laity) final responsibility for decisions concerning its doctrine and practice. By contrast, the proposed Canons are meticulous and rigid, looking backwards to the past rather than forward to the future' (p. 17).

The Primate and the South African Schism

Early in October, 1955, the Archbishop of Canterbury issued the following statement for publication:

'In order to avoid misunderstandings which may arise from the announcement that a small body known as "The Church of England in South Africa" has elected the Right Rev. G. F. B. Morris to be its Bishop, I must make it clear that this body has no place in the constitutional system of the Church of England and is not amenable to the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Bishop Morris has accepted episcopal office in this body against the advice and direction of the Archbishop of Canterbury and without any reference to the Archbishop of Cape Town. He has thus acted against the principles of the Church order observed in the Anglican Communion.

"I find it necessary to state that unless Bishop Morris withdraws from this position, I must regard him as having put himself out of communion with the See of Canterbury and outside the fellowship of of the Anglican Communion.'

(*Church Times, October 7th*)

A much valued contributor to the *Modern Churchman*, deeply perturbed by what he regards as the Primate's astounding act of Excommunication, prompts the following comment:

That the Archbishop of Canterbury should threaten Bishop G. F. B. Morris with excommunication from the Anglican Communion unless he withdraws from his position as Bishop of the Church of England in South Africa appears to us to be Papal, not Anglican, in its procedure.

When Gray, as Archbishop of the Anglican Church in South Africa, deposed Bishop Colenso of Natal he had the support of the majority of the South African Church, although the clergy had little choice in the matter since the S.P.C.K. and the S.P.G. promply deprived them of their source of income unless they did so. When however Colenso and his supporters appealed to the English Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, Gray's action was pronounced illegal and a complicated and distressing schism was created in South African Anglicanism which has continued to the present day. But it seems to us unjust that those members of the Church of England in South Africa who have clung to their legal ties with the Church of England should by the Archbishop's latest action be placed outside the fellowship of the Anglican Communion altogether. To the end of his life Archbishop Tait

maintained that Bishop Colenso, though 'deposed' by Archbishop Gray of Capetown, was as much Bishop of Natal as he himself was Archbishop of Canterbury.

Later, when Colenso died, it was understandable that the English Bishops should refuse to consecrate a Bishop of the Church of England in his place and so perpetuate the breach that had arisen. Instead, Archbishop Benson sought to persuade Bishop Macrorie, whom Gray had appointed as Bishop of the Church of the Province of South Africa in Natal, to resign in order that a new Bishop acceptable to both African Churches might be appointed in his place. For several years Macrorie refused to do so but eventually an attempt at reunification was made, Benson's own chaplain, Hamilton Baynes, having been consecrated to become Bishop of both Churches in Natal alike.

Although his attempt was wholly unsuccessful yet it testifies to the fact that *both* African Churches were recognized as Anglican by the Archbishops of Canterbury (Tait and Benson).

That there should be two separated Churches in South Africa, both claiming to be part of the Anglican communion and that various subsequent attempts to heal the schism have failed, is deplorable. Yet the fact cannot be ignored that it was the Archbishop of the Church of the Province of South Africa who created the schism by deposing Bishop Colenso, who it is generally recognized by English Churchmen to-day, was contending against tremendous odds for two great Christian causes which are now victorious, and of whom Dean Stanley said, preaching in Westminster Abbey: 'For these deeds he will be remembered when you who censure him are dead, buried and forgotten'.

But what about Bishop Morris and why should he be excommunicated by the Archbishop of Canterbury because he accepts the Bishopric of the Church of England in South Africa? Does not Bishop Morris' election provide the means, if properly handled, of terminating the South African schism between dominating Anglo-Catholics and uncompromising Recusants?

Bishop Morris is no novice. He was consecrated Anglican Bishop in North Africa by Archbishop Fisher in 1943 and after ten years service there, he retired, and was elected in September of this year by a unanimous vote of the Synod of the Church of England in South Africa, to be their bishop.

In the existing schism do not the members of the Church of England in South Africa need an evangelical bishop to confirm their communicants and ordain their ministry? Whilst new attempts at reconcilation are being made, a missionary mobile bishop in such a period of transition may rightly perform epis-

copal functions in territorial Sees administered by local territorial bishops. Such a dual episcopal ministry co-operated in the Primitive Christian Church. Since Archbishop Gray's time we have become possessed of valuable testimony to the existence of this dual episcopal ministry. This evidence is contained in that most interesting document the *Didache* (*The Testimony of the Twelve Apostles*) lost for centuries but re-discovered in 1883 in Constantinople. Its Greek text together with Introduction and English Translation was included by Bishop J. B. Lightfoot in his one volume edition of *The Apostolic Fathers* (1891-98). In his Preface Bishop Lightfoot writes :

> 'The work is obviously of very early date. . . . Thus for instance the itinerant prophetic order has not yet been displaced by the permanent localised ministry, but exists side by side with it as in the lifetime of St. Paul' (*Eph.* iv, 11 ; I *Cor.* xii, 28). (*op. cit* p. 215)

Why, in a Church which claims to be both Apostolic and Catholic, cannot Bishop Morris be permitted to exercise his episcopal function as an itinerant bishop ministering to a group of doctrinally orthodox congregations living in a number of territorial dioceses as the best possible means of creating a reconciling situation which may eventually end the South African schism?

CHRISTIANITY AS PHILOSOPHY

By The Rev. F. H. Cleobury, Ph.D., Rector of Hertingfordbury

I HAVE recently been reading again Maud Petre's fascinating study of Alfred Loisy, and I put it down with the strong conviction that sooner or later the issues he raised will have to be faced. Curiously enough, I then happened to open a newly published work—Sir David Kelly's *The Hungry Sheep*, and noticed a footnote on page 225 reading as follows, ' " Modernism " is now so " dated " that it is hard to believe that as late as 1925 Dr. Jacks could write in *The Hibbert Journal* that the fate of Christianity depended on the result of the controversy between Loisy and Harnack! ' About the same time I noticed a passage in a *Times* article which assured the reader that the liberal or modernist interpretation of the Bible is almost as dead as the earlier fundamentalism. These are two specimens of a technique which twentieth century propagandists are using with some success; if we all say often enough that something is dead we shall kill it.

In the decade preceding the first world war it began to look as though Christian thinkers were preparing frankly to face the problems raised by the claim of Christianity to be a historical religion. They were the more prepared to do this because they were sure that by relying on genuine religious experience and sound philosophical thinking they were building upon a rock. To the study of Christian origins one could therefore apply, quite dispassionately and without any side-glance at theology, the canons of historical enquiry which apply in the investigation of any other period. In other words, one could ask whether a certain interpretation of the data was true without worrying whether it was 'safe'.

But the period between the two world wars saw a change almost violent in its suddenness and completeness. Both the idealist philosophy on which many of these thinkers were relying, and the historical criticism which made such reliance the more necessary, were declared to be outmoded. With regard both to the philosophy and the history there was a minimum of reasoned discussion and a confident reiteration of the assertion ' All that is out of date '. The fact of the suddenness of the reaction has often been remarked on, but one of the most obvious explanations has been overlooked—the enormous loss of life in the first world war. Judging by war memorials in churches in districts in which comparision is possible owing to the absence of large-scale housebuilding between the wars, the ratio of deaths in the two wars would appear to be in the neighbourhood of seven to one. This heavy

loss of life hit the undergraduate generation trained in idealist philosophy and liberal theology just before the first war—the generation from which the younger university teachers in the twenties and thirties would have been drawn. The philosophical and historical reaction would doubtless have occurred in any case, but had there been no war these reactions would have met with, and benefited from, a much severer criticism than they actually got.

Some reaction, as I have just indicated, was to be expected. Indeed, with one aspect I am in sympathy—namely its protest against the tendency of *some* liberal thinkers to treat moral progress as more or less inevitable, and the Christian faith merely as a device for establishing a secure and prosperous human society on earth. The enormous slaughter of the flower of our young manhood was bound to result in a rejection of a purely this-worldly view of religion, and the revelation of evil in human nature was equally a revelation of the shallowness of much of our previous optimism. But the absence in the twenties and thirties of effective defence of the attacked positions led to a lowering of the intellectual level of the reaction. There was a spate of sweeping assertion, but very little patient analysis of the views attacked.

In the case of philosophy, we had the curious spectacle of an attack on idealist theism by atheistic or agnostic analytical philosophers being viewed with approval by theologians who, even if they did not go the whole way with Barth, thought that he had shown us how to by-pass philosophy altogether. But it did not strike these theologians that this was a very dangerous line to take. The man-in-the street must find it difficult to understand an exposition of the Faith which begins by admitting that we can know of no reasons for believing in God, and then goes on to talk of God encountering us in the Word. It must appear to him, as it did to the author of *Hebrews*, that before we can come to God we must believe that He is. Moreover, since they refused to put any eggs into the philosophy basket they had to put them all into the history basket. This meant that they had to claim to be very sure of their history, so the sweeping disposal of philosophy had to be accompanied by an equally sweeping disposal of all criticism except the 'cautious' or conservative variety. And there was a less respectable motive for disposing of philosophy; it is very difficult; it needs much patience; if we can sweep it aside it will save a lot of trouble.

There was a distinctly emotional side to the reaction of the philosophers against the monistic idealism of Green, Bradley and

Bosanquet—the philosophy which, in more or less degree, influenced the thinking of Christian philosophers such as Caird, Illingworth, Tennant, Rashdall and William Temple. William James's *A Pluralistic Universe*, which led the way, is largely an emotional protest; James didn't *like* the Absolute. And even a realist philosopher of the stature of C. D. Broad exhibited a very 'human' irritation when writing of the idealistic monists—particularly T. H. Green. Logical positivism in the twenties and thirties displayed the characteristics of a cult rather than those of an intellectual discipline; Oxford undergraduates reading philosophy for Greats or Modern Greats reacted almost like dervishes to any suggestion that philosophic wisdom had not been born into the world with Wittgenstein. On quite an early page of Professor Ayer's *Language, Truth and Logic* readers were expected to be convinced that all metaphysical statements—including all statements about God—were nonsense, since the existence of God is not a matter of sense-verification. A professor of philosophy at a Scottish University, himself an Oxford man, deplored in a letter to me the fact that 'only a Positivist or near-Positivist has any chance of a hearing with the younger generation' who are 'being denied, or discouraged from attempting, intimate acquaintance with the great thinkers of the Idealist tradition. One consequence is what I can only call "philosophical illiteracy", which hampers enormously the thinking of many brilliant young men.'

The ignoring of the post-Kantian idealists by analytical writers is really indefensible. Following Kant, they had provided an unanswerable reply to Hume's analysis of the human mind into a flux of atomic sense-events. For many years it appeared to me an inscrutable mystery that the logical positivists had never answered, but completely ignored, the Kantian defence of the 'knowing subject', and had reduced all mental process to an 'unearthly ballet' of sense-data and images. I was therefore most interested to find that Professor H. J. Paton of Oxford, in a work published in 1951[1], had felt as I had on the point. He says that Kant's refutation of Hume had been 'not so much rejected as simply ignored by the pioneers of the new doctrine', and he added that Kant's argument for the subject-self appeared to him sound, and if sound, obviously important. 'None the less it is entirely disregarded, if I am not mistaken, by some of the most acute of modern thinkers.'

The effect of all this on undergraduates from Christian homes can be imagined. But most of those who were reading

[1] *In Defence of Reason.* See pages 100 and 104.

philosophy as part of their graduation course before studying for the ministry reconciled it with their ministerial vocation by throwing all the weight of their faith on to 'The Word', in the Barth-Brunner fashion. Philosophical wisdom had been born with Wittgenstein, theological wisdom with Barth (or possibly Kierkegaard).

I shall now try to indicate in brief outline that the type of philosophising which encouraged this complete swing-over to history is itself outmoded, and that the over-emphasis on 'The Word' has weakened rather than strengthened the witness of the Church in the modern world. We cannot safely ignore philosophy and rely solely on an appeal to history.

It would be foolish to deny the large element of truth and value in some of the contentions of the analytical philosophers. We shall go back to metaphysics, but we shall always write with a very careful and critical analysis of our language and with a realisation that the question of its significance must be faced before we can face that of its truth or falsity. But the point that concerns us here is the retreat of philosophical analysts from the advanced anti-religious position which on the whole they occupied in the thirties. In the second edition (1946) of *Language, Truth and Logic* Professor Ayer withdrew the claim made in the first edition that all metaphysics can be disposed of summarily. Every metaphysical doctrine must be dealt with separately. And during the forties it became clearer that the majority of analysts were *not* logical positivists. Professor Ryle's *Concept of Mind* contained an attack on the 'phenomenalism' associated with positivism, and in the issue of *Mind* for July, 1950, Isaiah Berlin frankly assumed phenomenalism to be dead. In that year Professor Winston Barnes published *The Philosophical Predicament*, which contained some acute criticisms of some of the contentions of analytical writers. Even Professor Gilbert Ryle's *The Concept of Mind*, although universally recognised as a most important work, has by no means been regarded as the last word. It has received, for example, criticisms by Stuart Hampshire in *Mind* and by Professor C. A. Campbell in *The Philosophical Quarterly*. It is, I think, a misunderstanding to regard this book as 'behaviourist'; it deals not with the mind but with 'mind'—it criticizes our *concepts*, our language about alleged mental events, and there is much in it with which an idealist can heartily agree.

I would strongly recommend anyone who wishes to get a clear insight into the twentieth century analytical movement to read the British Academy lecture given by Professor Brand Blanshard of Yale in 1952 (O.U.P.). He ends with the judgment that the

analytical movement as a whole has *not* 'made out its case as it hoped to do. It has not succeeded in showing that speculative philosophy is meaningless.' And he holds, rightly as I think, that the movement has given us sharp-edged weapons which, if used wisely, can lead to a real advance in speculative thought.

With regard to the oft-repeated claim, made in the twenties and thirties, that Idealism is dead, the answer is that, like Charles II, it is an unconscionable time dying. Indeed, there has been a great revival of interest in Berkeley, and the writings of Professor A. A. Luce of Trinity College, Dublin,[2] are witness to the fact that the good Bishop of Cloyne has never been 'refuted'. The issues he raised are still very much alive. I myself have recently tried to 'draw' modern philosophers by writing two deliberately coat-trailing articles in defence of Idealism. The first, which appeared in *Mind*, July, 1952, challenged the claim of analysts to have disposed of the transcendental ego; the second, which appeared in *The Philosophical Quarterly*, October, 1954, claimed the Michelson-Morley experiment,[3] and the other facts which led to the Special Theory of Relativity, to be clear empirical confirmation of idealist ways of thinking. Neither of these has been answered, privately or publicly. Finally, I ought to mention a most important work. *Nature, Mind and Modern Science*, by Errol E. Harris (1954) which Professor Brand Blanshard, writing in the *Philosophical Quarterly*, April, 1955, describes as 'a very good book indeed' as operating from the base of 'an impenitent neo-Hegelian idealism', and as marking 'a resolute return to systematic and synoptic philosophy'.

From all this it is clear that we can discount generalisations about the outmoding of metaphysics in general, and of that idealist or 'immanentist' form of metaphysics in particular, which was the base of the reconstruction of theology offered by liberal theologians forty years ago. There is not the slightest reason for losing our nerve—our confidence in human reason as God-given—and for trying to base our faith entirely on a view of Revelation as a sheer break-in by God in human history, a process in which man's mental activity was confined to reading off propositions announced in a transcendent 'Word'.

But not only is there no *need* to take this line; it is actually unsound to do so. It is absurd to appeal to an alleged contrast

[2] His *Berkeley's Immaterialism* (1945) is a brilliant exposition and defence.

[3] A striking confirmation of this experiment has recently been made in England by Dr. L. Essen, of the National Physical Laboratory. He used not light-waves but radar-waves. See *Nature*, May 7, 1955.

between the uncertainties of philosophy and the certainties of history. On the one hand, it is not true to say that there has been no advance in philosophy towards the firm establishment of a spiritual interpretation of the Universe. Both scientific materialism, and the disintegrating analysis of Hume on which positivism relied, have been proved false. Recent philosophical analysis has given Christian philosophers a new technique; it has *not* rendered Christian philosophy impossible. And on the other hand it really will not do to claim that the 'higher criticism' has been exploded, and to take up an attitude towards the New Testament which, although we repudiate verbal inspiration with our lips, only the acceptance of verbal inspiration could justify. For nothing but wishful thinking or prejudice can blind our eyes to the fact that the area of certainty revealed by the study of Christian origins is small, and is surrounded by a large area of uncertainty.

This brings me back to Professor Jacks's remark about the vital nature of the issue between Loisy and Harnack.[4] Very broadly speaking, Harnack proposed to retain Theism and the Christian ethic, and to discard the eschatology and much of the Christology and soteriology of the New Testament. Loisy, on the other hand, insisted that Christianity *is* the Pauline-Johannine drama of redemption, and regarded Harnack's ethical Theism as religiously impotent. While Loisy did not believe that our Lord himself taught the full Pauline soteriology or the full Johannine Christology, he held (before his excommunication) that the acceptance of the drama of redemption as a Divine revelation adapted to our finite apprehension was by no means dependent on the acceptance of the view that it was taught by our Lord himself and that the fourth gospel is history.

Now it is clear that we can regard as dead the controversy between these two great scholars only if we believe that where they both rejected traditional orthodoxy they were both wrong. It would be very rash to say that this has been clearly demonstrated. To mention one point alone, it is surely clear that in spite of the great differences between the Catholic Loisy and the Protestant Bultmann, the latter has raised what is fundamenally the issue that Loisy raised.

The point I wish to make can be approached either from philosophy or from history. We can, in the first place, ask what must characterise the consciousness of a man who is to reveal

[4] An interesting study of the Harnack-Loisy controversy is contained in a sermon by the late Dean Rashdall delivered in New College, Oxford, on April 24, 1904 (*Principles and Precepts,* Blackwell, 1927).

God to other men—a man in whom is to be seen identity with God Himself. (To believe that such identity is possible depends on a certain conception of the nature of man and of his relation to God, but I cannot discuss that here.) Now if we say that a man cannot reveal God to others—cannot exhibit identity with God—unless he is *conscious* of being God, unless he remembers his 'pre-existence' and is consciously omnipotent and omniscient as he walks our streets, the answer surely is that this would not be a revelation of God in man, for such a being would not be human. If orthodoxy demands that we hold such a view of our Lord's earthly consciousness, it is difficult to see why Apollinaris was condemned.

Let us now approach the question from the historical standpoint. Is there clear evidence that Jesus did remember a previous Divine existence—that he was omniscient and omnipotent? In view of the answer we have just given to the philosophical question, we can see at once that in approaching the historical evidence which will enable us to answer the historical question there is not the slightest reason for holding that our faith is at stake—for holding that it is vital to be able to maintain that the picture of the consciousness of the historical Jesus given in the Fourth Gospel is *historically* accurate. This is what both Loisy and Bultmann, in their very different ways, have so clearly seen. That St. Paul *saw* the life and death of Jesus as a drama of incarnation and redemption—that the Easter faith was created—these are basic historical certainties. To Christians is to have felt the challenge, the impact on our entire personalities, of this Faith, whether by the 'preaching of the Word' (Bultmann) or by ritual and sacrament (Loisy). Our response depends not on cleverness—a mere ability to see that the evidence for miraculous events can stand up to criticism—but on something far deeper. It is a response of our whole personalities—a willingness to commit ourselves, to live as they alone will live who see in the redemption-drama and the resurrection-faith the key to the mystery of life.

We can now see why it is so mistaken of modern Christian apologists to deride philosophy. Surely our response to the proclamation that God has revealed Himself is far more likely to be positive if we already see *reasons* for believing in God. Admittedly, a man's rejection of the gospel may be due to *unwillingness* to accept—may be due to an unconscious hostility which he rationalises as intellectual difficulty. But there is no need to assist such a rationalisation by telling him that the intellectual difficulties are insoluble. Besides, it is not true that *all* intellectual difficulties over Theism are rationalizations of emotional attitudes. There *is* such a thing as honest doubt.

But I am now concerned not so much with the folly of deriding philosophy as with the accompanying folly of attempting to claim that that degree of certainty can be reached about *details* of events alleged to have occurred 1900 years ago which is necessary if the traditional view of Christian origins is to be substantiated. Broadly speaking, we have to choose between two interpretations of the historical data. The first is that during his earthly ministry our Lord was fully conscious of his unique deity—that he remembered his pre-existence as the Eternal Word. The second is that he had no such conviction, but that he gradually attained the conviction that he was called by God to fulfil the functions of the Suffering Servant and/or of the Son-of-Man (as distinct from the political) Messiah. There can, of course, be differences of opinion about details of the second type of interpretation (for example, did Jesus explicitly claim to be the Son of Man?) but these are of slight importance compared with the broad agreement that our Lord's conception of his person, and the conception of the disciples in the period before the controversy with Stephen and the conversion of Paul, did not include deity. On this view, the concept of the Son of Man was an apocalyptic one, and neither that nor the concept of the Suffering Servant was a concept of metaphysical union or identity with God.

Now those who accept the second interpretation hold that certain statements attributed to Jesus in the synoptic gospels, and almost all the discourses attributed to him in the fourth gospel, are not to be regarded as the actual words of Jesus, but embody the convictions reached about him by the reflection of the early Church. But those who hold this view are not committed to the thesis that these convictions were *false*. They can, and many do, hold that *in essentials* the Pauline-Johannine interpretation of the life and death of Jesus was a vital part of the Revelation—was inspired by the Spirit of God. As Loisy held (before he was excommunicated), the Christian revelation is the revelation of the drama of redemption—the adaptation to our finite understanding of mysteries which we can grasp in no other way. It is something far more than cold ethical theism. And as Bultmann holds, the proclamation of the gospel is the proclamation that the birth of the Easter Faith was an act of God.

My purpose in writing this article is to express the earnest conviction that, humanly speaking, the future of the Christian faith depends on our *reversing* the tendency of twentieth century apologetic to disparage philosophy and claim that the preaching of the Faith can be based on history alone. In addition to the

reasons I have already given, another now emerges, namely that if we rely on history alone, we are inevitably tempted to claim a more detailed historical certainty than the data warrant. We see this tendency strongly at work in Great Britain to-day; we are leading people to suppose that the Christian faith stands or falls with the *first* of the two above-mentioned interpretations, and this not by explicit statement so much as by implication. In broadcast addresses, for example, the sayings attributed to our Lord in the fourth gospel are appealed to without any indication that their authenticity is doubtful. This is both dishonest and dangerous. It is dishonest, for every honest scholar must admit, even if he himself is prepared to defend the first interpretation, that the second is quite tenable. And it is dangerous; the present 'conservative' critical mood is bound to pass. It is absolutely vital to face the fact that *it must be in the providence of God Himself that complete certainty in the matter cannot be obtained by the methods of historical criticism, and that the only absolutely certain historical fact before us is the birth of the Easter Faith.* If we are to build on the rock of fact and not on the shifting sands of subjective assessment of probabilities, it is to this basic certainty alone that we must appeal; in the birth of the Faith we must see the Act of God; it is futile to claim to see it in alleged events and sayings the authenticity of which must inevitably be a matter of honest difference of opinion between scholars.

To summarise. We need all our philosophy as a basis for a proclamation of the Faith to meet the needs of the twentieth century. Unless we approach the study of Christian origins with an already-formed acceptance of Kant's great triad—God, moral freedom and immortality—as inherently reasonable, we shall not find in the historical data *alone* overwhelming evidence that God is, and that He has revealed Himself to men. But if we *do* approach the history from this theistic standpoint, and with a willingness to pay the price in self-surrender which a revelation of the redeeming love of God will demand, we shall not find that our faith stands or falls with the acceptance or rejection of the first, or traditional, interpretation of the historical data. We shall reach (and here I can only appeal to my own experience) an overwhelming conviction that God is revealed in man at man's highest. And although this thesis is supportable by philosophical argument, we shall admit that men did not arrive at it—probably could never have arrived at it—by such argument. We shall proclaim that in the life and death of One who lived on this earth 1900 years ago, and in the resurrection-faith born in those who had walked with him in Galilee, God has visited and redeemed His people.

BENJAMIN JOWETT: PREACHER AND PROPHET

By E. D. Mackerness, M.A., Ph.D.

B. F. Westcott wrote to J. B. Lightfoot in December, 1860:

> 'I do not much care for *Essays and Reviews*, but they precipitate a division; and a reaction more perilous than scepticism seems already setting in. . . ' [1]

In a letter to his brother William (February 3, 1861), Stopford Brooke voiced the anxieties of one who was largely sympathetic towards the principles implied in the *Essays* . . . :

> ' . . . the great question which underlies [the problems advanced in the book], "What is the Inspiration of the Bible?" is one which must be settled. It underlies nearly every question of the day. . . .'

But if, as some held, *Essays and Reviews* exceeded its brief as a sample collection of academic writings, its effect was salutary as well as disturbing. For it stirred the conscience of those among the high-and-dry school of thought for whom ' orthodoxy ' was no more than a convenient intellectual smoke-screen.

The final chapter of *Essays and Reviews* is, of course, Benjamin Jowett's famous essay on ' The Interpretation of Scripture '. This ' essay ' is really a substantial treatise a hundred pages long. But Jowett summarises some of his major conclusions as follows:

> '. . . Scripture, like other books, has one meaning, which is to be gathered from itself without reference to the adaptations of Fathers or Divines; and without regard to *a priori* notions about its nature and origin. It is to be interpreted like other books, with attention to the character of its authors, and the prevailing state of civilization and knowledge, with allowance for peculiarities of style and language, and modes of thought and figures of speech. Yet not without a sense that as we read there grows upon us the witness of God in the world, anticipating in a rude and primitive age the truth that was to be, shining more and more unto the perfect day in the life of Christ, which again is reflected from different points of view in the teaching of His Apostles.' [2]

There is, it would seem, nothing particularly hallowed about certain epistles, books and chapters just because they happen to have been handed down to us as ' the Word of God '; that condition, in fact, does not warrant the application of special canons of criticism or evidence. Francis Bacon condemned

> 'that interpretation of the Scripture which is only after the manner as men use to interpret a profane book,'

[1] Ed. A. Westcott: *Life and Letters of Brooke Foss Westcott* (1903). Vol. I, page 214.

[2] *Essays and Reviews*, 5th edition, 1861, page 404.

and the Tractarians had encouraged the use of learned explications as an aid to better comprehension of the Word. A powerful plea for the use of such intermediary assistance was made by Henry Parry Liddon in one of his St. Paul's sermons. We do not, he argued, need a 'guide' to help us in reading ordinary books. In the case of Dante and Shakespeare, for example, few thoughtful men would now hold that the best thing is to disregard

> 'the immense explanatory literature which has in the course of centuries gathered round each of these great poets . . . And when we come to the Bible, which towers far more loftily above the highest works of human genius than do these above the lowest, this necessity of a guide is felt proportionately . . . '[3]

It would have been presumptuous for the editor of Plato to carp at commentators in general: but the effect of Jowett's contentions on the interpretation of Scripture was indirectly to call in question the motives of the textual critics, many of whom were gradually moulding the Scriptures into something which bore little resemblance to their original form.

In his amusing *roman à clef*, *The New Republic*, W. H. Mallock makes Jowett, in the person of 'Dr. Jenkinson', deliver a sermon on the subject covered in the last section of *Essays and Reviews*. Mallock's recasting of Jowett's ideas in the novel does not do them violence. Indeed, Dr. Jenkinson's peroration helps us to understand why Jowett's views came so readily to be classed as heretical. They reveal, it need hardly be said, a *tendency* which was bound to be regarded with aversion — the tendency, as Dean Church puts it in a letter to Dr. Moberley, 'to exclude the Divine, almost entirely'.[4] And yet this disposition is closely associated with a more general principle to which Jowett held, namely, the belief that our spiritual and intellectual life is jeopardized once we start making way for double standards of assessment.

> 'It seems to me.' Jowett wrote to R. B. D. Morier, on May 10th, 1861, 'that a great change is beginning in the religious feeling of England, and that persons are finding out that it is impossible to have one mode of reasoning, evidence, etc., about religious facts and another about all others. The reception of *Essays and Reviews* has been a remarkable sign of what is going on in people's minds. . . '

We may take this, perhaps, as a comment on Newman's tentative advocacy (afterwards discussed in the *Apologia*) of 'economy' and 'reserve' in the general discussion of theological matters: it is also an apology on Jowett's part for his deliberate espousal of the

[3] Liddon's *Advent in St. Paul's* (ed. 1892) pages 478-479.
[4] *Life and Letters of Dean Church* (1894) page 155.

Liberalism which Newman and his associates represented as such an intolerable incubus.

Jowett's sermons — with which I am here chiefly concerned — contain criticisms of the aspirations of the Tractarians. Preaching on John Bunyan and Ignatius Loyola in 1871, Jowett said:

> 'If, instead of reverting to the follies of the past, we could really extract the wisdom of the past . . . If, instead of returning to antiquated practices and disused symbols, the higher purpose of the eleventh century were capable of being translated into the language and customs of the nineteenth; then, perhaps, a truer ideal of religion and nobler forms of life might spring up among us . . .'[5]

A similar kind of quiet irony appears in a sermon on 'Greek and Oriental Religions', preached at Balliol in 1877 (*Sermons on Faith and Doctrine*) in which Jowett's bracketing of the 'ceremonial' with the 'external' stands as a faint critique of ritualistic practice. But there were points more fundamental than this in which Jowett was at variance with the Oxford apostles. According to Lionel Tollemache, the Master of Balliol 'had little sympathy' with Cardinal Newman.[6] In the *Apologia*, Newman defines Liberalism as

> 'the mistake of subjecting to human judgement those revealed doctrines which are in their nature beyond and independent of it, and of claiming to determine on intrinsic grounds the truth and value of propositions which rest for their reception simply on the external authority of the Divine Word.'

Now, to a man of Jowett's temper, there was something scandalous in the suggestion that intellectual activity of the kind described is a 'mistake'; to advance such an imputation, in fact, is to place a slight on human capabilities and to undervalue the privilege of mental freedom. In his sermons, Jowett enlarges several times upon the necessity of developing what we should call a 'spirit of enquiry' as a condition of spiritual health. In 'The Slow but Sure working of the Christian Spirit' (1878), for example, he ascribes some of the failures of Christianty to the fact that Christians have not always claimed, 'as Christ would have done, the good everywhere as their own; they have too often been at war with the progress of knowledge . . .'[7] There is, indeed, nothing amiss in fully asserting the capabilities of the human intellect: on the contrary, it is in realizing our own mental excellence that we become most truly religious.

[5] *Sermons Biographical and Miscellaneous* (ed. Freemantle, 1899) p. 52.
[6] Lionel Tollemache: *Benjamin Jowett, Master of Balliol* (4th ed., 1899), page 26.
[7] *College Sermons* (ed. Freemantle, 1895), page 111.

In their day, Jowett's College Sermons were an important part of an Oxford education. And Geoffrey Faber has claimed that Jowett was 'incomparably the greatest educator of able young men England has ever produced'.[8] But his eminent position in the academic world does not alone explain his preoccupation with the ways in which we derive knowledge and make use of it. In a sermon on 'Feeling after God' (1877), he reveals his distrust of abstract ideas when empirical data are to hand. Purely abstract notions are without meaning: they can only acquire a meaning when they find an expression in the things we know. 'The Bible,' Jowett once said, 'is not a book of abstractions . . . it can rarely be said to appeal to general motives for a confirmation of the truths which it teaches."[9] And in the same sermon he says:

> 'I shall not endeavour to combat further the common prejudice that God is only revealed to us in Scripture, but rather proceed to show what it is which the experience of ages adds to the knowledge of God which we find there. I am not speaking of what God is in His own essence, which neither faith nor philosophy can penetrate—but only of his manifestation to us . . . [10]

Jowett's antipathy to metaphysics proceeded from his conviction that indulgence in metaphysical speculation deadened the faculty of direct observation and confused the mind. In this connection his comments on T. H. Green's intention to compose a sermon in which the language of theology was to be omitted, are of particular interest. 'What,' he asks,

> 'will be the deepest, most useful, truest, most lasting form of philosophy? Common sense idealised; or rather a meeting of common sense and metaphysics, well expressed by Coleridge: "Common sense is intolerable when not based upon metaphysics." But are not metaphysics intolerable when not based on common sense? '[11]

Paradoxically, as Tollemache explains, Jowett wanted his pupils to have some training in metaphysics in order to develop habits of thinking which would enable them to do without metaphysics thereafter.

According to Jowett, our conception of Divinity may be enlarged from three main sources: by comparing Christian theology with Greek philosophy and the content of other religions: by observation of nature: and by the acquisition of ideas which present to us in a universal form what Scripture for the most part teaches

[8] *Ideas and Beliefs of the Victorians* (1949), page 403.
[9] *Sermons on Faith and Doctrine,* page 109.
[10] *Ibid,* page 98-99.
[11] Abbott and Campbell: *Life and Letters of Benjamin Jowett,* Vol. II, page 77.

by precept and example. For him, the attainment of 'knowledge' is largely a matter of mastering laws (he speaks of the 'laws of existence', the 'laws of thought', and so on) and of finding out how phenomena are, as he phrases it, 'ordered'. 'God has so ordered the human mind,' he tells us in a sermon on the 'Difficulties of Faith and their Solution', that

> 'our reason is in a great measure dependent upon our will—we cannot separate the one from the other. And when we are permanently and habitually leading a life which upon any view of another world, if there be another world at all, cannot but deserve God's wrath. It follows almost by a sort of natural logic that we shall cease to believe what we have so little interest in believing.' [12]

'Natural logic' may not always be a safe guide in matters of faith: but Jowett eschewed any connection with the kind of mental inertia which makes assent a matter of uncritical acceptance. At the same time, he was far from adopting the cold and sceptical frame of mind.

> 'This,' he explained, 'is a temper of mind which is the ruin of the head as well as of the heart; for no man can pursue knowledge with success who has not some sense of the higher purposes of knowledge, some faith in the future, some hope that the far-off result of his labours will be the good of man, and the fulfilment of the will of God in the world.' [13]

On the question of Jowett's 'scepticism', Lionel Tollemache, in dismissing the *Saturday Review's* statement that 'Mr. Jowett seems to revel in doubt and scepticism', advances the opinion that Jowett was a *half-conscious* sceptic — Mark Pattison being cited as a person who deliberately adopted a sceptical turn of mind. But in passing such a comment, one would need to know exactly how a 'sceptic' is to be defined; and on the evidence quoted above one hesitates to attach such a label to Jowett.

At this point, it may be appropriate to turn to the 'political' aspects of Jowett's preaching. The notion that we exist in order to bring about the betterment of others is present throughout his writings; and he continually insists that it is a Christian's responsibility to work for the enlargement of life among those who are less fortunate than ourselves. In a conversation with Lionel Tollemache, Jowett said:

> 'I believe that a great deal more is to be done to improve the condition of mankind, and that the great comfort for each of us is to feel that he has done, and is doing, something towards it.' [14]

[12] *College Sermons*, page 21.
[13] *Sermons Biographical and Miscellaneous*, page 58.
[14] *Benjamin Jowett*, page 38.

He was quick to observe that moral progress had failed to keep up with material progress:

> '. . . Freedom of trade has won a great victory during the last thirty years, but education has followed after with halting and lingering steps. And some of us may fear that a great opportunity has been lost, and that the blessing of material prosperity has been partly turned into a curse.'[15]

There also remained the unresolved doubt as to whether the present state of society were really preferable to the times in which our forefathers lived, or 'whether what we have gained in knowledge we may not have lost in force of character . . .'[16] We are obliged, come what may, to accept the age in which we live, for 'we cannot roll back the tide of secular knowledge, nor can we confine religious movements to the limits in which we desire that they should work'. The most reasonable way of facing up to the social and political implications of 'the sudden acquisition of much physical knowledge'[17] which distinguished the later part of the nineteenth century from all other historical periods, seemed to be to take man as he is (whatever his biological origin or ultimate destiny may be) and recognize that he remains what he always was, a being 'endowed with reason and conscience, capable of knowing God and of contemplating His works . . .'[18]

But Jowett did not think that the relationship between religion and politics can ever be a very direct one. It was, indeed, important that religion should not be translated arbitrarily from its proper sphere to an alien region of human activity; yet it could influence political decisions through its presence in the personal lives of men like Wilberforce and Lord Shaftesbury. Specific political situations are not necessarily referable to Scriptural precedents (other than at the level of casual analogy or reminiscence): the impulse to effect 'reform' is a matter of conscience as much as of expediency. But man does not live merely for the private gratifications of the moment: he exists partly for the sake of those who come after him. In a sermon called 'Spiritual Religion not dependent on System', Jowett commends the practice of regarding the future as a kind of touchstone against which to test our current modes of experience:

> '. . . The calm *resumé* of a man's present life in the light of twenty-five years hence would have a sobering and strengthening influence on him. He would make a plan for many years instead of living from year to

[15] 'The prospects of Christianity' (1871), in *College Sermons*, page 74.
[16] 'Study' in *College Sermons*, page 184.
[17] Bagehot: *Physics and Politics* (4th ed., 1876), page 1.
[18] *Sermons on Faith and Doctrine*, page 11 ('Darwinism and Faith in God,' 1871).

year. He would be able to deal with life in a larger and more liberal spirit . . .'[19]

From Jowett's *Letters*, we learn that he himself at the age of seventy laid down a plan for his own future, part of which was to entail a year's work on his sermons.

'There is no higher faith in this world,' he tells us, 'than to live for posterity, and to think sometimes of the good which we may do to a generation whom we shall never know and who can do nothing for us.'[20]

Liberalism, as Jowett suggested in a sermon on Dean Stanley, embraces a spirit of 'comprehensive charity' which is totally removed from the trivialities of sectarian squabbles. Or, as he said in a sermon preached at St. James's, Marylebone, in 1872:

'Happy is he who, having that moderation [of a mildly optimistic outlook], can still maintain his enthusiasm, making his knowledge of the world not an excuse for sitting down with his arms folded, but using it as an instrument for the service of God and man; like some aged men who never seem to grow old, but retain to their latest day the freshness and fire of their youth.'[21]

Jowett's own 'enthusiasm', as manifested in his sermons, bore no resemblance to fanaticism or eccentricity: it consisted rather in an unusual ability to find enjoyment in the contemplation of 'the idea of the good' as consummated in genuine Christian behaviour.

In this short survey of Jowett's preaching, several aspects of his work — his devotion to Plato, his interest in 'German rationalism', and his studies in the philosophy of Hegel — have not been touched upon. After what has been said about his reflections on the Scriptures, it may seem strange that there are those who have tacitly accused Jowett of 'voluntary vagueness' in his dealings with logic and ethical thought. On the subject of pulpit oratory he was quite definite. He maintained that the object of the sermon was to create 'aspirations' in the minds of the congregation.[22] Its function was to 'idealize life for us'; but 'there must be more in (a) discourse than mere morality'.[23] In other words, the feelings aroused during a sermon must be kept under control by loyalty to sound reasoning. Jowett's own sermons conform to this stipulation. But his *College Sermons* are much more than single pieces devised to meet the needs of particular occasions: they are, as it

[19] *Sermons on Faith and Doctrine*, page 191-192.
[20] *Ibid*, page 192.
[21] Printed in *Church Sermons by . . . Eminent Clergymen* (1877), page 199.
[22] *Life and Letters of Benjamin Jowett*, Vol. II, page 225.
[23] *Ibid*, Vol I, page 272.

were, part of a larger design. In a letter written to Frederic Harrison on April 30, 1861, Jowett said :

> '. . . I think you might do great good by turning your mind to religious subjects; endeavouring to supply as far as possible the constructive side, which (as you rightly say) is too much left out of sight in *Essays and Reviews*. I hope some of us may do something more ourselves in that way hereafter. It should be addressed, not to a small circle of Liberals, but to the mass of the world, and especially of the semi-religious world. . . '

It can be claimed that Jowett attempted in his preaching to do what he counselled Harrison to effect by other means.

A VACANT LIVING

By the Rev. J. K. Nettlefold, M.A., R.D., Rector of Bourton-on-the Water, Glos.

WHILE I was Unitarian minister in Norwich, I went once a year to preach in the Unitarian chapel at Bury St. Edmunds, where the minister was a woman. I spent the following Monday with her and gave a lecture in the chapel in the evening. We had the rest of the day free and used it in order to visit some interesting place.

Once we went to Longmile. The bus put us down at the corner of the village green, and we walked up a path to the church. The last house we passed before reaching the church gate was large, red-brick, Victorian and very ugly; it was evidently the vicarage. The gate hung open and the drive was overgrown with weeds; the living must be vacant. We went inside the church, which was full of interesting things. We were looking at a brass monument on the floor, when a large, untidy man came in, and began to explain what we were looking at. He was the verger and started to take us round the church. ' I can't stay,' he said several times; ' I have a grave to dig, the funeral is this afternoon.' But he did not leave us. He seemed to have something he wanted to ask us, for he kept looking at me, first at my black clothes and then at my unclerical collar. We were walking down the aisle to leave the church, when he saw my black hat, which I had left in a pew near the door. This decided him. He said at once : ' We have no parson here, and we want one badly. But he must be a gentleman and have money. There are a lot of gentry round here, and they are ready to be good to the church. But they want a man of their own sort, with whom

they can be friends. And this is a very good living. The right man could be very comfortable here.' He looked hard at me, and then at last said goodbye and went off to dig the grave.

As my companion and I left the church, I was wondering whether or no the verger thought I was the right man for the living. I was now wearing my black hat and looked rather clerical. As we turned a corner, we heard someone wishing us good morning. It was an old man, who was scraping some weeds from the churchyard path. He began at once to ask me what I thought of the church, how I liked the place and whether I would not like to be the parson here. 'I might like it very well,' I said, 'but there is a difficulty. I am not a member of your Church.' 'As for that,' he said, 'I would just as soon sit under one of your sort, as under one of our own parsons; and I don't care who hears me say so. And I hope you'll come to this parish all the same.'

We began to cross the village green when a tall man in shabby black and a cloth cap came up to us. 'Have you been up to the church?' he asked me. 'I used to be churchwarden there, and my father before me. But I don't go there any more. I am a Protestant, I am. They are Judas-priests up there.'

'What do you mean?' I asked him, hoping to hear more.

'They are like Judas,' he said, 'who sold his Master for a mess of potage. When you begin with wafers, then the next step is the Confessional, and who can tell what will come after that? I am a Protestant, I am, and I hold with Bishop Barnes'; and with this he left us.

'Judas who sold his Master for a mess of potage' did not sound quite right. I had just had time to separate the treachery of Judas from the cheating of Jacob, when we came up to a man who was sweeping the gutter. I stopped to say good morning.

'You've been loking at the vicarage,' he said. 'It's too big. People have no business to live in such great places nowadays. The nation can't afford it. And what a lot of poor families could be given homes in them. That's what I say.'

We left the village socialist, in order to get lunch at the local hotel. We had had lunch, and were sitting comfortably in front of the hotel fire, when a horsey man came in, ordered himself a drink, and then sat down beside us. 'I live up by the church,' he said. 'Such a pity we can't get a parson. The parish needs a parson, and it is a very good living.' 'Yes,' I said, 'we were up at the church and noticed that the vicarage is empty. But where will you find a man willing to live in that great house?' 'I see you understand things,' he said at once. 'We must pull it down, and build a neat, convenient little place with the bricks. There would

be enough bricks to build another house besides. It need not cost much.'

He had settled the problem of the house for us. He went on: 'You know, I am a churchman; but I don't go often to church myself; there are the horses to attend to and many other things to be done, on Sundays as on week-days. But I make my daughter go. I say to her: "Whether you are wearing breeches or not, off you go to early service, every Sunday." It is good for discipline. What we want here is a sporting parson. He would draw the people quick enough. Where I was in Sussex, the parson hunted two days a week, and the members of the hunt all came to the church from miles around. The church lane was full of motors on a Sunday morning. We want a parson like that here. And I could supply him with very good mounts.'

It was time for my companion and me to make our way through the village to the bus stop, to catch the bus back to Bury St. Edmunds. As we went out of the hotel, the hotel-keeper was standing at the door. He said good afternoon and added: 'I do wish we could get settled with a parson. Visitors who come to stay here do not like to find that the parson taking the services at the church no more belongs to the place than they do themselves. And they like to see the parson drop in here sometimes, and tell them about the village. If only we could get the right man, the people would respond wonderfully.'

He looked me full in the face and said goodbye. As my companion and I walked up the village street, I felt that everyone we met was scrutinizing us, weighing us up, to see if we would do or not. 'The people here are very anxious to get a parson,' I said to her, when we had passed the last house. 'And some of them seem to think that you and I would suit very well. We had better get away, before they take us and settle us here by force.' But was my companion inclined to linger?

SENSITIVITY

By Sir Harry Lindsay, K.C.I.E., C.B.E.

I HAVE chosen Sensitivity rather than Sensitiveness as the title of this article because the latter term has acquired a special connotation, the condition of one who is easily hurt. My subject is rather that of human evolution in the twin fields of (*a*) awareness and (*b*) activity. In the physical sense awareness and activity are alike dependent on the nervous system, acting respectively through sensory organs and through muscles, in other words receiving and transmitting impulses. Psychologically, awareness of one's neighbours — their characters, their potentialities — is closely tied to one's attiude and behaviour towards them. Spiritually, it is awareness of God which influences or should influence the conduct of our daily lives. To describe the condition of body, mind and soul inducing both awareness and action, Sensitivity appears to be the most appropriate term.

* * * *

If we trace the pattern of Creation, consistently maintained during many millions of years to influence the evolution of the animal kingdom, we find certain definite factors emerge. There is the environment which surrounds the creature, presses upon it and is itself in constant change—and environment includes not only inescapable factors such as climate and weather conditions but also the escapable (other creatures, enemies) and the desirable, mate, food and water supplies. Changes of the environment demand efforts from the creature in its reactions to weather or enemies and in its search for food and water. And the efforts induce Sensitivity in two principal spheres: in the extent of its awareness of its environment, in keenness of sight, hearing, scent or touch, or of any combination of these senses, and again in the range of its activities, i.e. in muscular development, control, and direction through the nerves. From this point of view the degree of Sensitivity in any creature is the key to an estimate of that creature's place in the vast diversity which characterizes the animal kingdom.

When we turn from the animal kingdom as a whole to that group which is humanity we find these same creative principles at work, but their field is greatly extended. A man's environment is not limited to the material surroundings of which he is physically conscious—to weather conditions, enemies or food supplies—it includes also social influence bearing on him through family, neighbourly, national or even international contacts. It includes

inherited traditions and religious beliefs which influence his character and behaviour. Even in material things proximity is not all-important, for civilized man draws on the whole world for food and drink and other requirements and traces his environment of weather and climate outwards and upwards to phenomena of the whole vast universe.

And again, in this extended sense man's environment is subject to constant change. As the social influences, under pressure of which he lives, ebb and flow, so also does his mind develop in reaction to them. Even inherited traditions and religious beliefs, which are based on historical facts and are therefore in themselves immutable, vary from age to age in their environmental pressure upon him as one aspect or another of his spiritual heritages acquires greater or lesser importance in relation to his mental and moral needs. To changes in his social, moral and spiritual environment man is forced to react, not merely in respect of the single life from infancy through childhood and adolescence to manhood and old age, but also for humanity as a whole, from primitive to civilized conditions.

It is not difficult to see how his reactions to environmental changes have affected man's evolution. New situations are embarrassing; they force man to make experiments; as a result of the experiments he undergoes experiences; as the experiences recur they promote the growth of experience; and the whole process induces Sensitivity in its two-fold form, in a wider range of awarness of his social environment, and in a wider range of activities expressed in his conduct and reflected in his character. It is exactly the same process as that which raises the animal in the hierarchy of living creatures. In the case of man, it raises him socially from primitive life to civilization and again in his spiritual life from paganism to increasing consciousness of God.

* * * *

But between human sensitivity and that of the non-human animal there is one outstanding difference, apart from the extent of the respective environments and the range of the reactions. In the animal, both the awarenesss and the activities are perfectly balanced; there is just the right amount of awareness to ensure adequate control and direction of the activities, in measures of defence and offence, in mating and in securing food; and the activities in their turn contribute to the animal's condition of alert watchfulness. We may reasonably conclude that Nature has reached a stage at which all genera and species have attained the greatest physical development, the most finely adjusted balance

between awareness and activity, of which they are constitutionally capable.

But with man the position is very different. Although human physique has probably developed to its zenith, the human mind is still immature, unco-ordinated. Whether, with the author of *Genesis*, we hold that man was the latest genus to be created or whether man's nature was more complex and therefore its development was bound to cover a longer period of time, it is obvious that in this particular respect man's evolution has lagged far behind that of the animal.

From birth to death, the individual human being is subject to the pressure upon him of other human beings; and, as life advances, so also grows his own personality in reaction to their personalities. Gradually, year by year, he comes to accept a code of conduct common to his family and neighbours, and therewith an attitude towards them revealing his growing character by his behaviour. He becomes more and more fully aware of them and they of him, and his awareness dictates his reactions to them.

And yet we know that in our daily life we are constantly liable to error. We constantly find it necessary to revise earlier opinions of our fellow men and women and therefore our attitude and behaviour towards them. As a genus, we have enthroned reason in supersession of instinct, and yet we grope for some still better directive.

Our Lord's parables are full of examples of this lack of co-ordination between awareness and action in human behaviour. Both the Priest and the Levite display it in the story of the Good Samaritan; the Priest would not look at the wounded man, the Levite looked but would not notice him, and both passed him by. The pardoned debtor who showed no mercy to his own debtor, the husbandmen who refused to pay their lawful rent, the foolish virgins—in these and many other such cases human Sensitivity is at its lowest, for it fails in its response to environmental needs. It is at its highest in the Good Samaritan himself and in the Father of the Prodigal Son.

* * * *

How does this lack of co-ordination arise in human beings? We do not find it in the animal kingdom, but then animal Sensitivity is limited to the physical, whereas in man the field of Sensitivity is greatly extended (as we have already noticed) to cover thought and feeling. We must therefore seek an answer to our question in the essential mechanism of man's mind, in the competition between reason and emotion, head and heart, between the claims of others and those of self.

As a first step, we must attack the common fallacy that a man's mind is the man himself, his ego or psyche, his soul or spirit, the essential willing self, by whatever name it may be called. But the mind is, or should be, the tool or instrument of the ego, controlled and directed by the ego through the exercise of the will. External influences reach the ego through the senses and stir either the emotion or the reason or both to activity. That is the point at which the lack of co-ordination—the dis-integration—may manifest itself; for if the ego is passive in its response, refusing to exercise it own will, it may find itself swayed by emotion to the exclusion of reason or by reason to the exclusion of emotion. The co-ordinated mind, on the other hand, is one in which the Sensitivity is integrated. Emotion and reason are kept in balance by the exercise of the will.

Secondly, an important factor in human thought and conduct is the attitude which the ego adopts towards its social environment. When the animal *primate* became man, and reason superseded instinct, there still remained a strong undercurrent of instinct influencing man in the conduct of his physical life. But instinct implies self-sufficiency and centres on self-preservation. In the world of Nature, through all the rigours of the struggle for existence, self-preservation is a determining factor in the animal's survival, and even the solicitude of parents for young is just one method by which the instinct of self-preservation is passed on from generation to generation. Self is thus a dominant feature of animal life, more potent even than the herd-instinct.

So also in man, amongst his inherited instincts self-preservation is strong, and when emotion and reason are first awakened they are at once enlisted by the ego into its own service as agents for self-preservation and self-advancement. Even that other instinct, the herd-instinct, is used for the security and satisfaction of the ego; just sufficient deference is paid to the claims of the social circle to enable the ego to live in security and so to be free to further its own interests.

If this line of thought is accepted—that selfishness is an inherited instinct and that reason and emotion are constantly enlisted in the service of the ego—we can see more clearly the origins of the lack of co-ordination in human Sensitivity. The attitude of the 'natural' man is introvert, turned in upon himself. The further back he traces his genealogy the nearer does he approximate to the animal. In other words he was not created perfect, as the first chapter of *Genesis* assumes; he was created immature, like the atom or the cell in isolation—immature, but with tremendous potentialities when acting in harmony with, i.e.

in self-adaptation to, his environment. He has not 'fallen' from a previous perfection. He has not yet grown up.

* * * *

If we agree that Sensitivity is unco-ordinated in man, we must look to God for the perfectly balanced Sensitivity of a perfectly integrated Person. We have no other standard. But this statement, though surely true, needs further consideration. Since the awareness of the Creator is perfect and covers all the experiences of his creatures, it is reasonable to conclude that he feels those experiences with them—is patient with the immature, compassionate with the sufferer, more ready to hear than we to pray, to give than we to ask, to pardon than we to repent. That being so, one would expect immediate divine reactions to human experiences—but we do not find such reactions. Indeed a common human complaint is that the wicked flourish whilst the righteous suffer, that disease and poverty often continue unchecked, generation by generation. How can one claim in these circumstances that the activities of the Creator match his awareness?

We must seek the answer in the conditions underlying God's Plan of Creation. He relies upon his children to co-operate with him in the execution of his Plan—indeed without their co-operation the Plan would fail. He looks to parenthood as an agency whereby divine patience is made available to the immature. He looks to family, friends and neighbours to provide sympathy for suffering and pardon for transgression. And finally, in the light of the life and teaching of Jesus Christ, even the stranger may count on generosity and the enemy on love.

From this point of view it is easy to see what a change would come over God's Plan if in this life the wicked were immediately punished and the good rewarded. There would be introduced into human relationships the automatic element which the Creator has so carefully and lovingly excluded. For human automata would never have a chance to exercise the rudimentary functions with which they are endowed—emotion, reason and will; these functions must be exercised freely, even though sinfully, if the great lesson of human self-insufficiency is to be learnt; even the sins are woven by God into the fabric of his Plan, and the very injustices of this life are signposts pointing to a Judgment to come.

* * * *

We are now able to complete our picture of the mechanism of the human mind. We had carried that picture to the stage at which emotion and reason compete with each other for the attention of the human ego. Now we can appreciate the importance of

the attention. It is a 'direction-finding' activity of the mind, controlled by the ego. Everything depends on the attitude adopted by the ego, on the direction in which it faces. Is the attitude fundamentally introvert or is it extrovert? If introvert, then the claims of the self become paramount and the contacts of the soul with the external world, the world of sense, are centrally directed to the satisfaction of the claims of self; in the result, a minimum of self-adaptation to the social environment and a minimum of Sensitivity. If extrovert, then the claims of others, stirring emotion and reason to activity, become paramount and the contacts of the soul with its own inner self are disciplined, dedicating the self to the service of others. Herein lies the ego's true relationship with its social and spiritual environment, the sign of an integrated personality.

We may now carry our argument on Sensitivity one last stage forward. If, as our argument has run, Sensitivity is an important feature of Creation, giving a sort of rhythm to all life—the taking-in, which is awareness, and the giving-out which is activity: if man displays Sensitivity to perfection in his physical life but imperfectly in his social life; and if he has learnt by Christian revelation that the perfect integration of Sensitivity is manifest in God and constitutes a gift at God's disposal of those who are conscious of their need of it; then it is reasonable to accept the following conclusions: (a) That the first stage in a man's apprenticeship in Sensitivity must be his awareness of his own lack of integration; and this apprenticeship he is now undergoing in his social, national and international life. (*b*) That the next step in his apprenticeship is to realize that the perfection of Sensitivity which he lacks can only come from increasing awareness of God, i.e. from spiritual Sensitivity. (*c*) That spiritual Sensitivity is spiritual awareness plus spiritual activity, a giving-out of the Spirit to match the intake of Spirit; that is to say, works to match faith, outward and active manifestation of the light within.

And our final question must be: Seeing that works are as important to faith as faith is to works in the individual life, how is man to assure for himself that co-ordination of Sensitivity to which he aspires? The answer surely lies in the vision of the uplifted Christ who draws all men to himself that they may learn of him to become fishers of men, doers and not merely hearers. They must become like him radically, God-conscious, living with God, looking to him, listening for him, leaning on him, learning of him, loving him, in other words assimilated to him.

And so we arrive at the great Law of Assimilation whereby man is enabled to visualize a perfect integration of his own com-

plex and unco-ordinated personality. He can only realize what he visualizes, he can only assimilate what he loves. Jesus Christ is God presented to man in a form in which he can be assimilated by man; and the assimilation of Christ is assimilation to God.

To be assimilated, then, to God is to assimilate from him something of his own perfection, the perfect co-ordination of Sensitivity; and since God is Love our awareness of him can only be Love, and our activity becomes loving obedience to his Will. 'For we all, with unveiled faces (with clear and loving vision), beholding as in a mirror (in Jesus, the reflection of God) the glory of the Lord, are transformed (assimilated) into the same image (of integrated Sensitivity) from glory to glory (from one stage of perfection to another) as from the Lord the Spirit.'

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF BISHOP C. J. BLOMFIELD

(Chester, 1824-28: London, 1828-56)

By P. J. Welch, M.A., Ph.D. (London)

It is often convenient, but not always very accurate or enlightening, to describe a complex historical character as 'a transitional figure'. But it is nonetheless true that, when we trace the career of Bishop Blomfield, we move in two entirely different worlds: eighteenth-century rural England, leisurely and undisturbed; and early Victorian London, bewildered, formless, and to a very great extent uncivilized. As we might expect, the character of the man is influenced by the demands that these two environments make on him; and in consequence Blomfield appears oddly compounded of contradictions.

To begin with, there is the conventional eighteenth-century success story of the boy, who, setting his heart upon a career in the Church, by sheer hard work won his way from a middle-class home to distinction in classical scholarship, and, by industry in pastoral work, skill in preaching and aristocratic patronage, secured first an unimportant bishopric and was then very soon translated to London. It was on the whole more usual for a High Churchman to be successful in this way; and, to outward appearance, Blomfield was a High Churchman, with High Church connections and proclivities. In a sermon on predestination he preached against Calvinism; he stressed the duty of a canonical adherence to the ritual of the Church, claiming for her external splendour; and, in the course of a controversy with Charles Butler, he referred with the utmost contempt to Hoadly and other Latitudinarian divines. The High Church bishop Howley smiled upon him, appointing him one of his chaplains and subsequently one of his archdeacons. It was Howley who recommended him for preferment to Lord Liverpool, a Prime Minister most sympathetic to the claims of High Churchmen.

But if we investigate further, we shall find that the pattern is less simple. While he was archdeacon of Colchester, Blomfield advocated the practice of family prayers and published a manual to promote their regular daily use. In 1830, he pleaded, in the most public manner possible, for the stricter observance of Sunday. These were to become, of course, two very familiar facets of Victorian religion, especially among the middle classes; and a cynic might observe that Blomfield was quick to identify himself

with increasingly popular causes. But the middle classes were not as influential in 1830 as they were in 1860, and in any case they included most of the Protestant Dissenters. Blomfield's campaign was a most unusual one for a High Churchman to undertake: in fact, in the matter of regular family prayers, he has among churchmen only one precursor. The agitation for a quieter Sunday was most unpopular: it made him a target for the thunders of *The Times* and the shafts of Dickens, and it appeared to identify him with the 'Saints' or with cranks like Sir Andrew Agnew.

As a rule, the High Churchman either took no part whatever in politics or else identified himself with the extremer forms of Toryism, opposing uncompromisingly any interference with the political or constitutional structure. Many of Blomfield's colleagues on the bench took the latter course: Howley, Phillpotts, Monk, Marsh and Van Mildert were among them. But Blomfield won the confidence of men of all shades of Tory opinion and worked on the whole harmoniously with Whig Governments too. He was happiest collaborating with such men as Peel and Graham, but he played a most important part, as Grey and Melbourne acknowledged, in overcoming episcopal resistance to the Reform Bill of 1832. He accepted the Whig invitation to preside over the Poor Law Commission, and thereby came under the spell of economists like Nassau Senior and bureaucrats like Chadwick. This was somewhat unfortunate for his future reputation; but it was puzzling to contemporaries; a bishop was moving in very strange company, and High Churchmen like Phillpotts detested the Poor Law Commission and its recommendations.

Most important of all, Blomfield suggested and promoted schemes, ultimately enacted by the Melbourne Government, for putting the resources of the Church on a new and businesslike footing and, in particular, for diverting the property of cathedral chapters to a common fund to be administered by a new permanent corporation, the Ecclesiastical Commission. There seems little very revolutionary to us in this departure, and there were a few contemporary churchmen like Arnold who reproached Blomfield and his associates for their timidity and caution. Many abuses remained, such as those concerned with patronage; and the administration of Queen Anne's Bounty, unsatisfactory as it was, was left untouched. But most of Blomfield's fellow-churchmen — of all parties — considered that the reforms were dangerous and unnecessary innovations. Tractarians like Pusey and Perceval, High Churchmen like Bagot, and Evangelicals like Charles Sumner, were at one in denouncing the Act of 1836 establishing the permanent Ecclesiastical Commission and the Ecclesiastical Com-

missioners Act of 1840 dealing with the diversion of capitular property. In their view, the Church was merely pandering to the incalculable and insatiable designs of an unsympathetic political party, which depended for votes on Dissenters and atheists. They ignored Peel's staunch support of the hated measures, and pointed instead to the ill-concealed suspicions and misgivings of his party. But Blomfield refused to think in terms of ecclesiastical and political alignments. He would be content if the Church satisfied two urgent demands: it must give some evidence that its resources were being skilfully managed and usefully applied; and it must somehow make a determined effort to provide more adequate pastoral care for the increasing population.

Blomfield, in fact, perceived more sharply than most of his colleagues the difficulties which urbanization was creating. This is not surprising, for problems of pastoral care were then more acute in London than elsewhere. It was not merely that the population was rapidly increasing, although that would in itself have presented a formidable challenge. But there were so many unskilled labourers and their families, and these were never very far from destitution. They were not all conveniently concentrated in one part of London, but were in Kensal Town as well as in Bethnal Green, and in Portland Town as well as in Chelsea. Even more daunting was the constant movement of population. We are inclined to regard this as a modern development, but in Blomfield's day the City of London contained few permanent residents. This in turn created a harassing special problem: many of the City churches, with their historical associations and aesthetic merits, were becoming for spiritual purposes redundant. Was it justifiable to demolish them and apply the proceeds of the sale of the sites to the needs of the untended suburbs?

Blomfield, as most students of Church history know, met these challenges by a vigorous campaign of ambitious church building. His ideal, never of course realized, was to have one church and two clergymen for every two thousand inhabitants. In 1836, he launched a most powerful and fruitful appeal for funds; he was constantly subscribing himself, both to whole areas and to particular churches; he enlisted the help of munificent sympathisers, such as the Baroness Burdett Coutts and William Cotton; he suggested to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners schemes of endowment and successfully promoted them; he seized every opportunity to secure sites cheaply; he was generous but discriminating in granting the patronage of new livings; and he was patient but firm in dealing with apprehensive clergymen who resented the division of their parishes. He was full of helpful and practical suggestions.

He told Tagg of St. John's, Bethnal Green, that fees accruing from the erection of tablets and the sale of vaults in the church might in part go towards buying a parsonage or augmenting the minister's stipend. He was not too busy to think of structural details: in St. Luke's, Berwick Street, he insisted that there must be sufficient room between the pulpit stairs and the communion table for the free access of communicants. Above all, he had all the legal requirements at his finger tips; and this was an enormous advantage, for the legislation dealing with new churches and new parishes was very complicated.

Both contemporaries and posterity have severely criticized Blomfield's extensive church building. It is quite true that many of the churches were built so hurriedly that they quickly fell into disrepair. Most of them were very large, and consequently expensive to build and to maintain. Some new parishes had no endowment at all, and in nearly all of them, pew rents were the main source of the minister's stipend, and they emphasized social distinctions precisely where it was most important to obliterate them. In fact, we can now be almost certain that the parochial sytsem, which had served rural England with reasonable success for centuries, was not suited to London at all, and it was a mistake to transplant it there. Blomfield and his collaborators would have done well to experiment with other methods of evangelization: they could have contented themselves with large parishes, each served by a large staff of clergy; and this would have been more fruitful and less expensive than the creation of a large number of impecunious and autonomous units, presided over by harassed, lonely and unappreciated clergymen.

But this is hindsight, and we cannot be absolutely certain that any method, however far-seeing, would have brought the millennium much nearer. And in Blomfield's defence, it is fair to stress two important considerations. The parish church in early Victorian England supplied, and was meant to supply, many of the social services now provided by the State. It was not merely a place for religious worship, but a centre where the parishioner could inquire about the lending library, the coal club, and the provident society which the minister and his helpers were running. Secondly, Blomfield himself was quite well aware that churches did not necessarily mean congregations. He suggested home missions: those who were too diffident or too unredeemed to come to church should be visited in their homes. The difficulty was that these were often very poor people who were at home only on Sundays. The middle classes responded well to Blomfield's church

building, and that was why churches like Christ Church, Hampstead, St. Mark's, Hamilton Terrace, and St. James', Paddington, were vigorous and flourishing throughout the century.

Blomfield did not think only of the spiritual needs of Londoners. As early as 1826, while he was still at Chester, he became chairman of a committee formed to administer funds subscribed for the relief of the distressed weavers of Spitalfields. It was he who supported such crusaders for improved public health as Chadwick, and in 1847, when a cholera epidemic seemed likely, he addressed a pastoral letter to his clergy, exhorting them, in the most practical terms, to bring home to their parishioners the importance of cleanliness. It is significant that two London clergymen who found great favour with him, Dukinfield of St. Martin-in-the-Fields and Tyler of St. Giles-in-the-Fields, were both keenly alive to the crying need for healthier living, cleaner air and purer water. Blomfield found time to be an active member of the Metropolitan Sanitary Association, which was petitioning Parliament to take effective steps to provide Londoners with a satisfactory public burial service. He listened to the persistent Chadwick, as a copious correspondence[1] shows, and Chadwick convinced him that both parochial control and the private enterprise of the eight joint stock cemetery companies were sure, eventually, to succumb to an outraged public opinion. When the Lords were considering the Public Health Bill of 1848, Blomfield moved a very important amendment, and the Government accepted it.[2]

But his eagerness to respond to new problems and conditions had one very unfortunate result. Slow to realize the purpose of Tractarianism and increasingly disturbed by some of its less profitable manifestations, he delivered in 1842 a Charge which satisfied very few of his clergy and left the more conscientious of them perplexed and uneasy. In his anxiety to secure the greatest measure of agreement, he denounced uncompromisingly several Tractarian practices which he considered 'Romish', but at the same time he expatiated on the importance of adhering strictly to the rubric and commended such apparent innovations as preaching in the surplice. The Charge created such confusion, and was in parts of the diocese so unpopular, that Blomfield had in effect to repudiate it in its more objectionable contents. His prestige never recovered from this episode: critics made no allowance for his ill-health at the time, or for the fact that he was merely trying to solve a difficult administrative problem with as little acerbity as possible.

[1] This is at University College, London; I am very grateful to Mr. John Wilkes for allowing me to see it.

[2] *Hansard* (Third Series) Vol. C, Columns 894-895.

He was not trying to answer the doctrinal questions which Tractarianism posed.

That was his real weakness. He was not only not a profound theologian, but he seemed doctrinally uncertain. He had his convictions, and he clung to them tenaciously, but they never seemed to shape themselves into a definite and coherent philosophy. Consequently, his doctrinal pronouncements seemed either confusing or opportunist. Hardly anyone could understand his attitude in the Gorham judgment; Samuel Wilberforce could not understand his views on the Eucharist, as expressed in the Charge of 1854; whilst in correspondence on the Jerusalem Bishopric, he and Gladstone appear to be speaking different languages. More serious too, his debating powers, generally so considerable, seemed in doctrinal matters to have deserted him; and formidable controversialist as he was, his successful battles were with men of affairs, not with fellow-churchmen.

This partly explains why he has not been accorded an illustrious place in English Church history. It is unimportant from this point of view that he generally had a bad Press and that Barnes of *The Times* detested him. Church history is after all written mostly by clergymen, and Blomfield's policy and methods had upset too many clergymen for his praises to be sung in many parsonages. His detractors came from every party in the Church and included such men as Sydney Smith, William Rogers and R. W. Church. Every clergyman who considered that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners had unfairly treated him, every clergyman who saw some of his most loyal and responsive parishioners transferred to another parish, every clergyman who neglected his pastoral duties, every clergyman who, in a new parish, found conditions cruelly disappointing — and they were many: all these had some cause for looking at Blomfield's efforts unsympathetically. Evangelical clergymen thought him too indulgent to the Tractarians, and the Tractarians considered that he persecuted them because he declared against elaborate ceremonial, with surpliced choirs, flowers on the altar and processions. Liberal clergymen resented his stand against F. D. Maurice. Above all, he seemed unsuccessful — much more unsuccessful than he really was; and the world, to which clergymen belong, rates success very highly.

But it is singularly ungracious of churchmen to speak slightingly of him. Even if we leave out of account the improved relations between Church and State, and even if we consider the value of the Ecclesiastical Commission and the diversion of resources open questions, there are other aspects of his work from which the Church derived nothing but advantage. His contribution to

Church extension is in itself an amazing achievement. Archdeacon Sinclair referred triumphantly to his consecration of two hundred churches, and most of the churches in the inner suburbs of London owe their origin to him. It is quite true that he did not adequately provide for the spiritual welfare of Londoners, but as no one seems likely ever to do this, this is hardly a damning indictment. What are incontestable are the vigour of his crusade, the sincerity of his purpose, the sureness of his direction, and the infection of his example. Where there were doubt and diffidence, he brought decision and assurance. Nor was he interested only in the Church in London, or even in the Church in his own diocese in England. He did a great deal for the Church overseas. His open Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1840 led to the opening of a fund to endow additional bishoprics in the colonies, and in 1842, as a result of a pastoral letter to the London clergy, more than £8,000 was raised in the diocese for this purpose. Largely through increased resources, five new colonial sees were created in 1842, and Blomfield consecrated bishops of Gibraltar, Antigua, Barbadoes, Guiana and Tasmania.

It was largely through his efforts that the Convocation of Canterbury acquired some corporate consciousness. Most of those who pleaded for the resumption of the synodical functions, for so long in abeyance, were avowed Tractarians, and many influential clergy of moderate views, such as Archdeacon Sinclair, were very suspicious of them. Blomfield, by persistent patient work in establishing and serving on useful committees of Convocation, gave the lie to those who predicted that a deliberate assembly of churchmen would be alarmingly contentious. It was he who won over the hitherto suspicious and unsympathetic Archbishop Sumner, and it was not his fault that Governments of every political complexion were inexorable. Blomfield was also never tired of emphasizing the importance of putting education of all kinds in a religious context. He played a prominent part in the foundation of King's College, London; and he declared that it was 'a branch of ministerial duty' and 'the most hopeful part of ministerial exertions' to countenance and encourage National daily schools and Sunday schools, to supervize their management, and 'to prevent the instruction from degenerating into a mere form of knowledge.'[3]

We have him to thank for insisting upon a certain standard of scholarship and conduct from his clergy. His view was that the clergy must 'make their own behaviour a standard for the world to aim at'. No one deserved less respect than a clergyman who,

[3] C. J. Blomfield: *The Primary Charge to the Clergy of London,* pages 26-28.

'by his dress, his language, his manners, and his pursuits, makes it manifest to the world that he is ashamed of his order, as his order has good cause to be ashamed of him'. Members of the sacred profession should, in the first place, exercise great caution in the choice of their pursuits and amusements; they should, secondly, practise great moderation in the pursuit of them. Lastly, whatever work they were doing, and into whatever company circumstances threw them, they should never forget 'the dignity and importance of their calling'.[4] He refused point blank to license a curate who hunted, and no amount of scholarship could excuse a clergyman who smoked. But scholarship was very important. When he became Bishop of Chester, the low intellectual attainments of potential clergymen appalled him. At London he made clear that he expected all ordination candidates to know thoroughly the historical and prophetical parts of the Old Testament, and to be acquainted with the whole of the New Testament, except the Book of Revelation, in the original language. He also required evidence of ability to translate plain and easy English into correct grammatical Latin. If a candidate, at the age of twenty-three, could not write 'correct Latin' and construe the Greek Testament, he was 'either greatly deficient in diligence and serousness or not qualified by natural endowment for the office of an expositor of God's Word'.[5] He received only graduates as candidates. The typical clergyman of the latter half of the nineteenth century, a little forbidding, but nearly always decorous, dignified and cultured, is a direct result of the policy of Blomfield and bishops who felt as strongly as he did.

Even his refusal to identify himself unmistakably with any party, repugnant and puzzling as it was to most contemporary churchmen, was really a service to the Church. A tolerant comprehensiveness on the part of bishops was not very common; in certain dioceses, such as Exeter, no Evangelical clergyman stood the remotest chance of preferment, whilst in others, such as Winchester, the prospects of a Tractarian, if not quite as hopeless, were far from rosy. But in the London diocese there was room for William Goode of All Hallows-in-the-Tower, as well as William Scott of Christ Church, Hoxton; and room for Pratt of St. Stephen's, Coleman Street, as well as Richards of All Saints, Margaret Street. This generous breadth was most beneficial and wise, because the diocese contained many prominent Evangelical clergy, especially in the City, whilst in the forties and fifties the

[4] C. J. Blomfield: *The Charge to the Clergy of Chester* pages 14-16.
[5] C. J. Blomfield: *The Primary Charge to the Clergy of London,* page 37.

newer parishes tended to attract clergy with leanings towards Tractarianism. True, Bennett had to leave St. Barnabas, Pimlico, but Bennett was an exceptionally uncompromising character, and there was justification for the feeling that his ministry was on the whole doing more harm than good. It is also quite clear that Blomfield himself preferred clergymen of moderate views. That is how Sinclair became Archdeacon of Middlesex. But any clergyman who conscientiously and vigorously discharged his duties could count upon Blomfield's support, and this must have greatly heartened such indefatigable workers as Burgess of Chelsea, Dale of St. Pancras, and Archibald Montgomery Campbell of Paddington. More important still, Blomfield originated a tradition of impartiality and comprehensiveness which the London diocese has never quite lost sight of; and this may well be considered one of his most valuable legacies.

METHODISM AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By the Rev. C. J. Wright, B.D., Ph.D.

THIRTY-FOUR years after the 1921 Lambeth Appeal a new approach to Church Unity has begun. The years that the locusts have eaten are, for better or worse, behind us: gone, like the battles long ago. But the basic question remains. Have the lessons been learnt?

The Methodist Conference formally approved in July this year the beginning of new conversations with the Church of England. The issues were perlexing: the hesitations were many. But the decison was, in the end, clear and reached with practical unanimity.

I am reminded now of a conversation I had with the late veteran fighter for Unity, Dr. Scott Lidgett, who represented for so many years both the spirit of Methodism and the forward-looking zeal of all the Free Churches in England. He combined evangelical passion and practical effort for social betterment. His interest in theological issues was only mastered by his concern for the immediate duty. In this conversation we communed about the churches and the future. He replied, as an ecclesiastical statesman: We must build on The Nicene Creed, and we must seek for revision on Trinitarian lines.

But the germane point of this conversation was the Unity issue. I shall always remember the account he gave me of his long efforts among Free Churchmen, some of whom found it so difficult to forget the old unhappy far-off things. But I chiefly remember now his association with Archbishop Davidson, the past conversations at Lambeth, and—most vividly—his last visit to the Archbishop. Briefly, what Scott Lidget said to me was as follows:

> 'He asked me to pray with him. I knelt by his bedside and prayed. When I rose and took his hand, he said: 'Au revoir my friend. We have worked and fought together for a long time for Unity. I am laying down my arms. You will for a time carry on the fight until the battle is won. It will be a hard fight, but God will be with you.'

The battle has not yet been won. Scott Lidgett, like Davidson, has departed.

I believe that the main obstacle to—shall I say?—Advance (not victory) is within the Church of England. The battles of long ago are still, in *Ecclesia Anglicana*, the operative battles. The divisions of the Renaissance and Reformation era are still

the sacrosanct divisions. Much heat is still generated when dogmas about ministry and sacraments are discussed. Revision of Canons is regarded as the first necessary step to putting the Church's house in order: though it is now being seen that some of these Canons, if approved and acted upon, may well bring a head-on collision with what is most just in the nation's life. The position of the Laity in the deepest concerns of the Church is still a violently contentious issue.

I believe, more firmly than I did in 1944, that the first important step that ought to be taken for Unity in this country is between the Church of England and Methodism. I do not believe that we ought to wait until all the dangers inherent in the present disunities in *Ecclesia Anglicana* are seen to be overcome. This, I know, is not the opinion of many. For, as was said to me both by Archbishop William Temple and by Bishop Guy Warman in 1942 when I ardently desired a united Holy Communion in Manchester Cathedral to conclude a joint Religion and Life Campaign: 'We must do nothing that will create greater disunity than now exists'. That opinion was not my opinion then. It is, more certainly, not so to-day. *We must act.*

I am happy and humbly proud to be in the Modern Churchman's movement. Only lamenting at times that it has not the vigour and influence it ought to have. I hope therefore not to be misunderstood if I remind our members of some of the things said and done by the Church of England's greatest evangelist. For these sayings and deeds are most germane to the present situation.

On March 20, 1739, John Wesley wrote to James Hervey:

> 'Permit me to speak plainly. If by catholic principles you mean any other than scriptural, they weigh nothing with me. I allow no other rule, whether of faith or practice, than the Holy Scriptures; but, on scriptural principles, I do not think it hard to justify whatever I do. God in Scipture commands me, according to my power, to instruct the ignorant, reform the wicked, confirm the virtuous. Man forbids me to do this in another's parish: that is, in effect, to do it at all; seeing I have now no parish of my own, nor probably ever shall . . . I look upon all the world as my parish.'

In his *Journal* for November 3, 1787, Wesley wrote:

> 'I had a long converstation with Mr. Clulow, on that execrable Act, called the *Conventicle Act*. After consulting the *Act of Toleration* with that of the fourteenth of Queen Anne, we were both clearly convinced, that it was the safest way to license all our chapels, and all our Travelling Preachers, not as Dissenters, but simply as "Preachers of the Gospel"; and that no Justice or bench of Justices, has any authority to refuse licensing either the House or the Preachers."

The success of John Wesley in getting his itinerants licensed as 'Preachers of the Gospel' illustrates vividly both his evangelistic conviction and his administrative determination and acuteness. Few lawyers of first-class ability in these issues have failed to note what seems on the face of it to have been an evasion of the Act—clearly, an evasion for conscience sake, but nevertheless an evasion. For the Act used was an 'Act for exempting their Majesties' Protestant Subjects, Dissenting from the Church of England, from the penalties of certain laws'. How Wesley managed this, as historians declare, 'is not at all clear'. The point, however, is that Wesley did it and that he did it openly and with the most serious intent. For the one thing that troubled Wesley until his death in 1791 was that his followers might become separated from The Church of England.

Wesley saw clearly where his Societies were moving, and indeed how his own actions—especially over his 'ordinations'—were going to speak more loudly than his words. As was said by a mid-nineteenth century Wesleyan President, Dr. Beaumont, looking back on the way the separation had come:

> Mr. Wesley, like a strong and skilful rower, looked one way while every stroke of his oar took him in the opposite direction.'

But here again the principle that necessity of good knows no final law of stagnation remained the guiding principle of Wesley's actions. Here are his own words in 1786 by which he gave reasons for his ordinations: in America and in Scotland; as for his other 'variations' such as field-preaching, the meeting of societies in preaching houses and the annual Conferences:

> 'These are the steps, which, not of choice, but necessity, I have slowly and deliberately taken. If anyone is pleased to call this separating from the Church, he may. But the law of England does not call it so, nor can anyone properly be said so to do, unless out of conscience he refuses to join in the service, and partake of the sacraments administered therein.'

Wesley then went on to give reasons for some recent ordinations for Scotland, a Presbyterian land where Episcopalians were dissenters:

> 'But for all this, is it not possible there may be such a separation after you are dead? Undoubtedly it is. But what I said at our first Conference above forty years ago, I say still; "I dare not omit doing what good I can while I live, for fear of evils that may follow when I am dead."'

It should be noted that when Wesley 'ordained' any of his carefully chosen preachers he first ordained to the diaconate and—usually within a day or two—to the presbyterate.

But what about Wesley's view of the Episcopate? This so contentious issue of practical ecclesiastical politics, of traditionalist theological catholicism, and of irrelevance to moralist conviction and to spiritual ardour and insight?

John Wesley thought, as a good Anglican, that episcopacy was of the *bene esse* of the Church as an institution in the world. Like Hooker, however, he did not regard any one form of polity as essential to the furtherance of the Kingdom of God or to the activity among heterogeneous peoples of the ONE ETERNAL SPIRIT. Such a view would have been no less blasphemous to him than it was to the wisest and best of *Ecclesia Anglicana* throughout its 1400 or 1500 years of chequered history. But Wesley was not a philosopher. He was not prepared to think through his position to the unending end. In this he was, again, of the school of Hooker and not of the school of the Cambridge platonists: and certainly not of the eighteenth century rationalists like John Locke whom Voltaire so unreservedly admired and applauded. John Wesley was a logical and administrative evangelist. Clarity was to him, as I think, next to godliness. That is why his theology was so neat and tidy. That is why he never minced his words when any issue that seemed vital to his work was involved. As, for example, when in his *N.T. Notes*, discussing 'the anti-christ' and the much-vexing question at the time as to whether that meant the Pope, he briefly dismissed the problem by the statement that he knew no one in history who had a better claim to the title.

All this is seen both in Wesley and throughout Methodist history, both in the old world and in the new—pre-eminently in the new. To confine myself, however, to the founder of Methodism.

On January 20, 1746, on the road from London to Bristol he was reading, as he rode along, Lord Chancellor King's *Account of the Primitive Church*. This is his comment in his Journal:

> 'In spite of the vehement prejudice of my education, I was ready to believe that this was a fair and impartial draught; but, if so, it would follow that Bishops and Presbyters are (essentially) of one order; and that originally every Christian congregation was a church independent of all others!'

Here is an interesting, even striking, basis for the twentieth century *bon mot* among scholars on Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, and Independency:

> All have won, and all shall have prizes.

It is also common knowledge to all students—though alas not to all ministers and priests of the Gospel and its history—that Wesley, with an uninterrupted succession of historians, came to regard 'the uninterrupted apostolic succession' as an 'unproved

fable'. Yet he so respected this venerable tradition that he only departed from it when a higher imperative confronted him at the end of the American War of Independence. This, I would like to think, is familiar to all students of ecclesiastical history. I must therefore confine myself to the episcopal issue.

The American colonies, that had become a republic, had been in the diocese of London. In 1780 Wesley besought Bishop Lowth to ordain someone of piety for the new republic, reminding him that the three men there 'knew no more of saving souls than of catching whales'. By 1784, with many if not most of the 'loyalists' gone, the situation became so urgent, to the great itinerant, that he took his decisive step. He wrote:

> 'For some hundred miles together there is none either to Baptize or to administer the Lord's Supper. Here, therefore, my scruples are at an end; and I conceive myself at full liberty, as I violate no order and invade no man's right by appointing and sending labourers into the harvest.'

So Wesley, the presbyter, himself performed the crowning irregularity of his ministry—the irregularity that still mightily offends a diminishing section of Christian thinkers and administrators, but an irregularity that is increasingly deemed as most regular and most fitting to the basic pragmatism, in faith and life, of the English nation. The call of duty being to this nation ever higher than the call of dogma, and sacrosanct custom ever subject to the deepest needs of mankind.

Yet Wesley was careful to call one of those whom he ordained, or set apart, Thomas Coke, 'superintendent' not 'bishop'. The Americans, however, preferred the New Testament 'bishop' (in its English translation) as more clearly indicating the duties involved: so that from the first Methodism in the United States is 'The Methodist *Episcopal* Church'. In 1785 this Church declared:

> 'As the translators of our version of the Bible have used the word Bishop instead of Superintendent, it has been thought by us that it would be more scriptural to adopt the term Bishop.'

It is interesting to recall now the abortive effort made by this same Anglican presbyter and Methodist Bishop or Superintendent, Thomas Coke, in 1798 when the growth of the Methodist Societies was becoming almost phenomenal. Fearing that, through the pressure of the practical situation, Methodism would be entirely alienated from the parish churches, he suggested to the Bishop of London (after consulting the Attorney-General who approved the idea) that a number of the Methodist preachers approved by Conference should be ordained by Anglican Bishops

for a peripatetic ministry of the Sacraments throughout England. The approach came to nothing, for when the Bishop of London approached the Archbishops on the matter the reply was that they could not ordain men whom they had not chosen and whom they could not control.

I must briefly note one more factor in a sorry history (as it seems to many, though not to those who believe in the mysterious over-ruling Providence of God). My plea is that if we would advance we must first understand. Knowledge of history is necessary for the rectification of history. And I hold this conviction as not inconsistent with my basic philosophy of Providence: believing that while 'all things work together for good to those who love God' many things work for evil to those who resist His Nature and His Ways.

I have referred to the curious situation created by the fact that the *Act of Toleration*, passed for Dissenters and to enable them to exist in spite of the *Conventicle Act*, was a shelter for the Methodists in a time of storm. Wesley believed—contrary to the framers and sponsors of The Enabling Act—*that a national Church is not a denomination and should embrace all who are willing to be embraced. That is why Wesley held that his followers were members of the Church of England provided they did not positively dissent from its ministry of word and sacrament.* It was said by a later historian:

> 'The generality of the Preachers and people, in connection with Mr. Wesley, were of the Established Church. Nevertheless, as a defence against the violence of brutal men, the greater number of the Preachers and chapels were licensed, according to the Toleration Act.'

Wesley's position was difficult, as was that of the Countess of Huntingdon. Convocation was not meeting. Frank and full discussion was evaded, for no Bishop or Archbishop seemed to have any policy to meet the situation. Some said: Better to get rid of heretics and schismatics.

Some years before Wesley's death the difficulties became acute. The contention of some within the Church of England was that those who were not dissenters should not benefit by the Act of Toleration and therefore should not be granted licences for their places of worship.

Persecution of Methodists followed inevitably. They were told:

> 'You must not only profess yourselves Dissenters; you must declare, that you scruple to attend the service or Sacraments of the church, or we can grant you no relief; for the Act in question was made only for those who have these scruples.'

Justices announced on the issue :

> 'The Methodists could have no relief from the Act of Toleration, because they went to church; and that, so long as they did so, The Conventicle Act should be executed against them.'

Methodists were imprisoned and fined, and the apologia was,

> 'Their licence was good for nothing, because they were Churchmen.'

John Wesley asked a member of Parliament :

> 'Now, Sir, what can the Methodists do? They are liable to be ruined by the Conventicle Act, and they have no relief from the Act of Toleration ! If this is not oppression, what is? Where then is English liberty? The liberty of Christians? Yea, of every rational creature, who, as such, has a right to worship God according to his own conscience? But waiving the question of right and wrong, what prudence is there in oppressing such a body of loyal subjects? If these good magistrates could drive them, not only out of Somersetshire, but out of England, who would be gainers thereby? Not his Majesty, whom we honour and love; not his ministers, whom we love and serve for his sake. Do they wish to throw away so many thousand friends, who are now bound to them by stronger ties than that of interest?'

He asked the member to appeal to Pitt on the matter. And he reminded the lawyer who had openly declared that he would drive Methodism out of Somerset :

> 'Yes, when you drive God out of it.'

Wesley also appealed to Bishop Pretyman Tomline of Lincoln, Lincolnshire, the home of the Wesleys at Epworth. Speaking of the Methodists he said :

> 'They hold all her doctrines, attend her service, and partake of her sacraments. · · They desire a licence to worship God after their own conscience. Your Lordship refuses it, and then punishes them for not having a licence ! So your Lordship leaves them only this alternative, "Leave the Church or starve." And is it a Christian, yea a Protestant Bishop, that so persecutes his own flock?'

This was in 1790 and Wesley wrote to his bishop as one 'on the brink of eternity'. He signed himself 'Your Lordship's dutiful son and servant'.

I have recalled this history in the hope that while the time may well be later than we think, it is not yet too late to obey the inner dictates of Truth, Justice and Love.

The real situation to-day is not the situation John Wesley sought to confront. A friend asked me the other day : 'Would Wesley approve what his followers are saying and not saying, doing and not doing to-day? All the empty churches—what do they mean? And what could *he* say and do?' I replied : 'Wesley lived and died in the eighteenth century. We live and die in the twentieth. In his own day Wesley did not avoid the immediate duty or evade the practical action. Nor had he learnt the trick of

so many theologians.' And what is that? asked my friend. I replied: 'The trick of astute accommodation, of facing every way, of shuffling so rapidly that it seems to many that you are advancing'. Twinkling feet often bespeak a stationary mind. What is real situation to-day?

With the permission of the Editor I defer my answer to the March issue of the *Modern Churchman*.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE TRAINING OF MOTHERS*

Challenge to Heritage by Mrs. Oakley deals with the upbringing of the young. She has been moved to write her book by the deterioration of national character during the last half century. Her book is prefaced by commendations from Sir Henry Self, Dr. Hubback, ex-Metropolitan of India, Dr. E. C. Warner, Dean of the medical school, Charing Cross Hospital, and F. J. Powell, Metropolitan magistrate.

The keynote of the volume is the indispensable function of the mother as the educationist during the first seven years of her child's life. How to train such mothers and how to provide them with the necessary leisure and environment to carry out their educational functions seems to be the real problem. To-day young women naturally desire to go out into the world and to secure the independence and interesting experience which a job provides. Should they marry they wish to retain their freedom and independence. How to do this and to bring up a family is the problem. In this connection another problem arises. Are the parents as well fitted to bring up a family as are trained nurses and educationists? Cannot the State by providing centres for the nurture and education of children which strive to combine scientific training with the affection and personal interest of family life be the right solution? English feeling recoils from this solution. Dr. Barnardo's Homes are infinitely better than bad homes but the natural home, if a good home, is much the best solution. This good family home must be first and foremost a Christian home, so Mrs. Oakley fervently insists—love united to the demands of duty and mutual service extending as opportunity offers to those outside the family. But recreation and the right use of leisure has to be provided in the home and this is no small problem in our modern family life. The wireless and television provide this in abundant measure, but serious social workers are complaining to-day of the falling off in reading of sound literature in every class. It is so much easier to turn on the wireless and see or hear what it has to offer than to concentrate on the reading of a book. In this sphere parents and guardians have carefully to select the best of what the B.B.C. has to offer: and how very good educationally the best is.

'The most important stone in this country is the hearth-stone,' but we ought not to be sitting round it when we ought to be 'up and doing' at school, at church and on the sports field.

V.M.B.

* *Challenge to Heritage*, by Ruth Anderson Oakley (St. Catherine Press, 1955; 6/-).

AGNOSTICISM, GNOSTICISM AND KNOWLEDGE OF GOD

The preacher asks dramatically: 'Who of us believe in that little word, "God"?' The man in the pew answers: 'What do you mean by that little word, "God"? We cannot answer your question until you answer ours. Is it the "Old Man in the Sky"?' The physicists have compelled us to give up that way of thinking about God. If the preacher answers: 'By "God" I mean infinite mind,' the man in the pew retorts: 'What do you mean by infinite mind? Mind we know, but we cannot conceive what is meant by infinite mind. Is this not really theological *camouflage*?' The man in the pulpit answers: 'Yes.' This phrase and many others must seem to be camouflage to those who have not studied the history of the development of Christian doctrine. And how few there are who have either the means or the will to do that.

Euclid told the Egyptian prince to whom he was tutor that there is no royal road to learning. To-day it is 'the man in the street' who has to be told this. There is no way of securing the wages without the work.

Nevertheless, a new age may well be able to provide new methods and this we believe to be true even in the teaching and learning of the Christian Religion. John Wren Lewis insists on this in his booklet *Return to the Roots,* a summary of a course of lunch lectures delivered in St. Margaret's, Lothbury, our M.C.U. church in London.[1]

We are not sure that we are in agreement with some of the statements made by Mr. Lewis in these lectures but we do agree with him that the Church's theologians have sought in their Christian apologies to maintain that God is a *personal* being and that we can hold *personal* intercourse with Him and He with us if we go the right way about it. We also agree with Mr. Lewis that God is a moral being and that His morality must be interpreted supremely in terms of love. We recall Dean Rashdall saying that he regarded St. Augustine's treatise on the Trinity as the best of his theolgical expositions because Augustine interpreted the Trinity in terms of love. The Father, Love eternal originating and directing the creative process; the Son God historically unveiled under the limitations of human personality, the supreme object of the Father's love; the Holy Spirit, the Divine Spirit of Love, Truth and Freedom operating in manifold manner in the guidance and inspiration of human history.

We ought to add that the English theologian is under two great limitations which do not exist for the Greek theologian.

(1) In Greek the definite article is used of the Father and Creator but is not used of the Son, Jesus Christ. The opening words of the Fourth Gospel are an example of this. In the Beginning was the Word and the Word was in Personal communion with *the God* (i.e., God the Father) and the Word was God without the article (i.e., possessing the Divine Nature—essentially Divine).

(2) In Greek two different words are used for knowing but both are translated 'know' in the English. In Greek the one word means to know *intellectually*; the other Greek word means to know *Personally*. In the Greek Testament it is the second word which is used of the human knowledge of God, i.e., the knowledge derived from experience of the Divine Presence and guidance. It is the equivalent of the Scotch *ken*. 'I ken the Lord and the Lord kens me.' Hence the phrase 'I know God' contains a double and often misleading meaning for an English audience.

H.D.A.M.

[1] *Return to the Roots,* by John Wren Lewis; 1/6. Modern Churchmen's Union 1955. (A Study in the meaning of the word 'God').

CORPUS CHRISTI*

Readers of Professor Mascall's previous book, *Christ, the Christian and the Church,* will be glad to have an expansion of some of the themes there dealt with. Anything that Professor Mascall writes is worthy of serious and respectful consideration, both for his own profound and devout scholarship, and for the service he has rendered to Anglican theological studies in calling our attention to the important work which is being done by French Catholic scholars in the field of eucharistic theology. We have also cause to be grateful to Professor Mascall for the emphasis he has placed on the mediatorial possibilities which lie open to the Anglican Church to-day: his

* *Corpus Christi,* by E. L. Mascall. Pp. xii, 188. (Longmans, 1955; 15/-.)

own words are, 'the Anglican theologian today is uniquely favoured for the task of recovering the lost unity of an integrally Catholic theology.'

The present book consists of nine essays and an appendix. Most of the essays have already appeared in various theological journals, but their collection in this more permanent form is welcome and fully justified by their importance. As the title of the book suggests, the essays are all concerned in some form or other with the Church as the body of Christ, and with the great central Christian sacrament by which the life of the Church as a sacramental body is nourished. Perhaps one may be permitted to say that, even if they disagree, members of the Modern Churchmen's Union should read this book with care, in order that they may come to a better understanding of what the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist at its best and deepest really implies. It is a little doubtful whether Dr. Mascall, speaking with the greatest respect for his scholarship, has given an equally sympathetic study to the Protestant side of the debate, especially to the Protestant insistence on the authority of Scripture as the standard by which tradition must be judged. But nothing is so much to be desired as that both sides of the debate should arrive at a fuller and more tolerant understanding of each other's position.

The essays are full of interesting and stimulating points of view. In the valuable essay on the Eucharist Theology of St. Thomas, Professor Mascall has developed what he has called a doctrine of 'sacramental signification' which calls for careful consideration. It is briefly described in his own words as follows: 'If sacramental signification is a metaphysical, and not merely a physical or a moral fact, bread and wine have a higher and not a lower metaphysical reality if they have the status of sacramental signs of the Body and Blood of Christ than if they have the status of substance.'

It is doubtful whether many readers of the *Modern Churchman* will be convinced that private Masses and Benediction are 'legitimate and desirable,' but the reasons which Professor Mascall brings forward in support of his view are not to be lightly dismissed. Another of his speculations, for so he would seem to regard it, namely, that bishops continue to be bishops in heaven, may be perhaps received by some weary bishops with a sigh, even if it be dignified by being called a *ratio convenientiæ!*

One minor point, not intended to be pedantry since its implications are not entirely negligible, is the statement on p. 52 that 'the Hebrew language has only the one word *berakah* to denote what we describe by the two words "blessing" and "thanksgiving".' The regular Hebrew word in common liturgical usage for the term 'thanksgiving' is *tōdah,* and the difference is not without importance because *berakah* has in both Hebrew and Arabic what may be called a sacramental significance which *tōdah* has not. In Pedersen's *Israel,* I—II, pp. 182ff., a full discussion of the sacramental significance of *berakah* may be found.

Whether we agree with all that Professor Mascall has written or not, we have every cause to be grateful for his profound and devout exposition of the Catholic position with regard to the central mysteries of the Christian faith.

S. H. Hooke

THE PSYCHIC MESSAGE OF THE SCRIPTURES*

In a commendable effort to bring Churchmen and Spiritualists to a better mutual understanding, Mr. Powel has contributed a very readable little book which shows how psychical research can illuminate many of the familiar

* *The Psychic Message of the Scriptures,* by T. Rowland Powel, M.A. (Oxon.), foreword by the Rev. G. Maurice Elliott (The Omega Press, 1954; 7/6).

events and stories recorded in the New Testament. A first century belief about the physical universe is not the more true because it is shared by Spiritualists in the twentieth century, but the case for 'paranormal' phenomena (Mr. Powel unfortunately uses the word 'supernormal') rests upon solid evidence which cannot be ignored. The demonstrable discoveries of psychical research may very well lead us to see some of the 'miracles' as things which could have happened and probably, or at least possibly, did. Perhaps we shall one day see the science of the paranormal take its place amongst the physical sciences; the question will not then be 'could these things happen?' but 'under what conditions do these things happen?' 'The late Dr. Barnes,' writes Mr. Powel, ' . . . caused much controversy by totally rejecting miracles and that wise and humane magistrate, Mr. Claude Mullins, wrote: ' . . . that early in his life he drifted away from Christianity because he could not honestly believe in miracles ' (p. 4.); and again, ' Commentators who wear Modernist blinkers explain away these "miracle" stories' (p. 48). This is hardly fair for he has previously written (p. 18) 'psychic science now shows them to have been supernormal, but natural, phenomena . . . they fit into the divinely ordered scheme of things.' Whether or not Modernists have 'believed in miracles' they have usually urged that phenomena, whether psychical or not, fit into a divine order of things, and that belief in certain arbitrarily selected miracles is not an essential part of the Christian faith. Most would agree with Professor Jung's recent remark that 'Miracles appeal only to the understanding of those who cannot perceive their meaning. They are mere substitutes for the not-understood reality of the Spirit' ('Answer to Job,' p. xii). Nevertheless, we should know something about them and the value of Mr. Powel's book is that it relates the traditional Christian miracles to similar occurrences which have been observed and studied in modern times. This is a popular dissertation upon a subject which merits—and is beginning to receive—much more serious attention and sound thought than it has generally received in the past.

J. F. B. Chitty

THE CLERICAL HODGE: *RUSTICUS EXPECTANS**

Clerical Biographies and Autobiographies have, we imagine, much more interest for the clergyman than for laymen. Perhaps that is why Gray's Elegy omits any reference to the clergy. Yet Swift, Addison and Bishop Butler, not to mention John Wesley and George Whitefield, had few laymen in the 18th century who surpassed them in influence—but it must be admitted that these clergymen were not country clergymen. To-day it is the lives of the country clergymen which secure readers and that not because of the interest of their lives but because of the insight they give us into the rural life of England.

Mrs. Janet Courtney, the daughter of a rural clergyman, in her *Recollected in Tranquility* (1926) describes the terrible dullness of the country vicarages and attributes the fact that not a few of the boys born in them became the administrators of the British Empire, was due to the fact that 'the boys fled to the farthest places of the earth' in order to escape from the boredom of their early environment.

Two recent books, *The Eighteenth Century Country Parson* (1955) written by the Rev. A. Tindal Hart and *The Nineteenth Century Parson* (1954)

* *The Eighteenth Century Country Parson*, by A. Tindal Hart, M.A., D.D.; *The Nineteenth Century Country Parson*, by A. Tindal Hart, M.A., D.D. and Edward Carpenter, M.A., Ph.D., B.D. (Wilding & Son, Shrewsbury, 1955 and 1954; 14/9 and 16/9).

written by the same author in conjunction with Canon Carpenter of Westminster Abbey, suggest that their volumes provide restful relaxation for those wearied by the records of political intrigues, diplomatic deceptions, economic conflicts and sanguinary wars. The lot of the country clergyman, as of his parishioners, was pedestrian.

> 'Far from the madding crowd's ignoble strife
> Their sober wishes never learned to stray;
> Along the cool, sequestered vale of life
> They kept the noiseless tenor of their way.'

But although the lot of the country clerics was pedestrian their service was of immense national value. They laid the foundations of national character.

There is much curious information incorporated in these two latest volumes of clerical biography. For instance: we have heard much of the splendid virtues of Susannah Wesley, the mother of the Wesleys, but their father appears in the background as something of a clerical scamp—certainly as a young man he was injudicious, not immoral, and financially irresponsible, but Dr. Tindal Hart writes of him in his later years:

> 'It is pleasing to learn that during his last twenty years at Epworth he not only merely out-lived the hostility but won the affection of his parishioners; and the number of regular communicants rose from twelve to a hundred.'

Of Laurence Sterne, the creator of my Uncle Toby and the diarist of a *Sentimental Journey,* Dr. Tindal Hart writes:

> 'He was also a conscientous parish priest, judging from his visitation return for 1743:
>
> > 'I do reside personally upon my cure, and in my parsonage-house . . . Public Service is duely performed twice every Lord's Day. I catechise every Sunday in my Church during Lent, but explain our religion to the children and servants of my parishioners in my own house every Sunday night during Lent, from six o'clock until nine. I mention the length of time as my reason for not doing it in church. The Sacrament is administered five times every year in my church. There are about 250 communicants, above one half of which communicated last Easter (p. 48).

So much for the eighteenth century country cleric. Of the nineteenth century cleric we may cite two outstanding examples: Charles Kingsley, later Rector of Eversley, when in his early years he was appointed to the country curacy of Pimperne, wrote:

> 'I am full of plans for Pimperne . . . We must have a regular rule of life, not so as to become a law but a custom. Family prayers before breakfast; 8.30 to 10, household matters; 10 to 1, studying divinity or settling parish accounts or business, doors open for poor parish residents; between 1 and 5 go out in all weathers to visit sick and poor and teach in the school; in the evening we will read and draw and feed the intellect and fancy' (p. 8).

Our other selected example is that of Harford Battersby when he became Rector of Keswick and later founder of the Keswick Convention.

> 'On me it depends mainly what the character and tone of religion in this place in future years shall be; nay in a considerable degree, what the character of the people shall be; for have I not the pulpit, the

> schools under my control; do not the most tremendous consequences turn on the question whether mine is a powerful or a feeble ministry? Never have I had occasion so deeply to lay to heart the words: "Take heed to thyself and to thy doctrine" ' (p. 9).

When Frederick Temple, Bishop of Exeter, was bidding farewell to a country rector, the rector said: 'Next time you come Bishop, do bring Mrs. Temple with you.' Temple replied: 'I can't do that, I am accustomed to roughing it, but she isn't.'

But besides the rural cleric and his rural parishioners there is the rural parish itself with all its wealth of ancient history for those who understand how to decipher and interpret it. Here in it you have aspects of the nation's life inscribed *in parvo* going back in some cases to the times of the Romans and geologically far behind them. Not a little of this record written in stones and wells and roads and boundaries has been deciphered and used as a basis for teaching local history.

But besides the wrongly named 'dead past' of a country parish there is its abounding natural life—botanical, ornithological, insectivorous, etc., revived with every spring.

Gilbert White, divine and naturalist, author of *Natural History of Selborne,* has inspired thousands of rural dwellers in English parishes to observe and note these parochial happenings and call attention to their significance.

The latest and not the least worthy of these devotees of the rural parish is the son of a rural vicarage in Cornwall, Geoffrey Grigson, the author of *Freedom of the Parish* published last year (Phœnix House, 21*s*.) which concludes with the avowal: 'So I hold to my parish, as to the smallest unit of a familiar and valuable environment.'

H.D.A.M.

ISRAEL AND PALESTINE: THE HISTORY OF AN IDEA*

In this moving book the veteran scholar, Martin Buber, expounds what may be called the mystique of the relation between Israel and the land which, strangely enough, is known by the name of one of its ancient enemies, the Philistines. The message of the book can be well summed up in a sentence from a *Midrash* quoted by the author which makes God say, 'I love this land more than anything else'; on this the author's comment is, 'the union of people and land is intended to contribute to the perfecting of the world in order to become the Kingdom of God.'

In his brief preface the author tells us that his book is meant to throw light on the spiritual history of a faith, and concludes with the words, 'But it is only right that, as long as such a spiritual reality lives, history should be responsible to it rather than it should be responsible to history.' These are brave words; but we remember that it was the prophets of Israel who were the first to proclaim the doctrine that the judgement of history was the judgement of God. In the end history will pronounce the divine judgement on how far this heroic and pathetic venture of the resurgence of Israel as a national home is the fruit of a divinely directed spiritual impulse. There is a suspicion of *hubris* in the demand that history should be responsible, whatever that may mean, to Israel's national venture.

There is an element in Jewry, far from negligible in learning, piety, and devotion to the national ideal, which believes that the judgement of God in

* *Israel and Palestine: The History of an Idea,* by Martin Buber, 1952. (East and West Library, London; 18/- net.)

history was to be seen in the *Diaspora,* and that the scattering of Israel to the ends of the earth was part of the divine purpose to make Israel the bearer of light to the Gentiles. Such a belief, in its acceptance of that judgement, may have at least an equal claim to be a spiritual faith, even when it doubts whether the rebirth of Israel as a political entity is indeed in accordance with the divine will.

But, nevertheless, the book is a touching manifesto of the faith that moves mountains. It also contains much interesting information on Rabbinical and Cabbalistic modes of reasoning and of interpreting the Old Testament. One observes a tendency, noticeable in other books by Jewish authors, to claim a monopoly in certain religious ideas. For example, Klausner claims that nothing corresponding to Israel's Messianism is to be found in any other religions, and Buber doubts whether anything resembling the Jewish vision of Zion as the navel of the earth is to be found among other peoples. But the prophets of the 7th and 6th centuries, clearly felt that Babylon presented a special challenge to Zion's claims in this respect; and long before Babylon rose to supremacy, Nippur had occupied a unique place in early Sumer and Akkad as the religious centre of that country.

But the book is of value, both as a demonstration of a profound spiritual impulse that underlies the rebirth of Israel into nationhood, and as containing portraits of certain remarkable figures little known outside the narrow circle of Jewry.

S. H. Hooke

THE MODERN PREDICAMENT*

The Modern Predicament is the title which Professor Paton has given to his Gifford Lectures (latest edition, 1953).

This modern predicament is thus defined by Professor Paton:

> 'Man seems to be faced with an unbridgeable gulf between science and religion or—it might be better to say—between knowledge and faith' (p. 374).
>
> 'The divorce between mind and heart is far more dangerous to religion than to science; for it is directly opposed to that very wholeness at which religion aims' (p. 375).

The function of the philosoher is to harmonise the different points of view of the scientist, the artist, the moralist and the saint into one consistent whole. This is the purpose of Professor Paton's book.

> 'A philosophy that restricts itself to a scientific point of view can have no use for religion' (p. 376).

What is clear is that science

> 'has and can have no concern with judgements of value or with judgements of what ought to be . . . Explicit assumptions about reality are metaphysical not scientific' (p. 377).

Hence when the conclusions of science are being offered to us we must bear in mind that this

> 'world of science is one from which something is being systematically left out' (p. 378).

The above are phrases selected from the author of *The Modern Predicament.*

* *The Modern Predicament,* by H. J. Paton. (George Allen & Unwin, 1955; 30/- net.)

Scientific research necessitates limitation; science is an affair of departments and the scientist is primarily concerned with truth in his own department. The philosopher is not only concerned with attempting to harmonise truth secured in each of these scientific departments but he is also concerned to secure for this harmonization a harmonization with truth in various other fields of human experience, and what is more, with the potentialities of truth yet to be experienced by mankind. This is the task of the philosopher and it is a tremendous task.

In ordinary speech where this harmonization attempts to include religion it is called the harmonization of religious faith with scientific knowledge. And yet that phrase may easily be misleading by suggesting the unreality of the speculative hypotheses which faith offers in comparison with the certified realities provided for us by science.

We recall Professor Percy Gardner remarking that in the Christian Religion the contrast is not between Faith and Knowledge but between Faith and Sight—a contrast of two methods of securing Truth. 'Faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the proving of things not seen.' So runs the more accurate translation of *Heb.* xi, 1. Faith is primarily psychological, the demand of man's religious and moral nature, and if faith be left out of life, frustration and pessimism ensue the further we proceed on our pilgrimage in which there are no Delectable Mountains and no Celestial City.

We recall a saying, this time by Dr. Illingworth in his book *Christian Character*: 'The Christian Religion refuses to be proved first and practised afterwards—its practice and its proof go hand in hand.' Its method is experimental. It is a working hypothesis but its instruments and range of investigation are not those of the scientific laboratory, neither are its conclusions.

Its conclusions are vague and may even seem negative compared with the precise achievements of the scientist. But here the philosopher is concerned to point out to the scientist the limitations of the scientist's sphere and so the lack of finality in his scientific conclusions. The scientist does not begin at the beginning and so is incapable of reaching the end. What leads us astray so often in Christian apologetic is the effort to make everything right and tight from the scientific standpoint in a creative process which renders this achievement impossible.

The verdict of the agnostic pessimist: 'Vanity of vanities, *all* is vanity' (*Eccles.* i, 2; xii, 8). The scientist has no right to pronounce nor has he any right to deny to the saint his right to contradict it when he pronounces his conclusions of the whole matter: 'Fear God and keep his commandments for this is the whole duty of man' (*Eccles* xii, 13).

What Dr. Paton is profoundly concerned with is the injury that false religion or superstition can do to restrict the influence of true religion. Hence the supreme duty of religious teachers to teach true religion and to resist the temptation to overstatement and the appeal to proofs which are not proofs. To popular religious teachers this restriction will demand loss of quantity but it will lead to an increase in quality and render their apology an abiding and developing influence.

Professor Paton's analyses of the significant issues of the great religious teachers in the last half century are masterly. Otto's comprehensive presentation of the Numinous in his *Das Heilige*; Father Poulain's analysis and presentation of the various types of Christian Mysticism in his *Des Graces d'oraison*—'His treatment of the subject is dry, scholastic, and matter of fact, and this is all to the good in dealing with a topic which lends itself to cloudiness and emotion' (p. 147).

Of Rabbi Martin Buber's poetic spiritual idealism Professor Paton writes:

> 'He expresses himself in an unfamiliar idiom—in the language of Jewish prophet turned philosopher. . . like some of the best poetry, his book (*I and Thou*) is crammed with thought, and this gradually becomes clearer with repeated study' (p. 163).

We venture to think that many untrained readers of Professor Paton's analyses will gain more from them than from the original works.

Last but not least we cannot conclude without referring our readers to Dr. Paton's judgement on the much over-rated contribution of Kierkegaard, who, it must be remembered, wrote before the

> 'Darwinian theory and before the development of Biblical criticism' (p. 120).

Of Kierkegaard and his disciples, Dr. Paton writes:

> 'Whatever value such literature may have as a corrective of complacency, and however deserving of pity may be the painful experience at its root, this obsession is not merely primitive, but neurotic—a mark of disease and not of health. It resembles that terrible obsession with demons and devils which, in an even cruder way, tormented the lives of so many mediæval saints' (p. 75).

H.D.A.M.

CHRISTIAN REALISM AND POLITICAL PROBLEMS*

> 'The trustful acceptance of false solutions for our perplexing problems adds a touch of pathos to the tragedy of our age' (p. 24).

This sentence, which opens the essay upon *The Illusion of World Goverment,* opens also a view into the whole book. Were it a text for an old fashioned sermon, the book would be that sermon, drawing out every shade of meaning inherent in each of the significant words. That our 'problems' are 'perplexing' no one would deny; that their product is an age of 'tragedy'—of a cosmic drama, the plot tortuous and unfolding inexorably towards an end which is both longed for and feared yet utterly unknown—this is the notion in which all thought, all art and science are involved. That 'solutions' in their turn prove 'false,' adding yet another conflict in the plot to be resolved, keeping the excitement of the drama high from hour to hour; and that each is 'accepted' so 'trustfully' as it comes upon the stage, and for so long. prolonging the action, driving some to cynicism, others to despair, adding 'pathos', sadness, spiritual suffering, to a situation already pathetic—all this we perceive in rare moments of detachment, although most of our lives are involved so closely within it. It is Professor Niebuhr's task to shake our trust in fallacies, to do us the hurt, which is also our healing, of severing us from our illusions, so that we may feel the pains which we ought to feel, and apply our minds to our wounds, not to their wrappings.

Certainly Dr. Niebuhr does not accept the fallacy that everything, including theological essays, should be made easy. If we want the wisdom which he offers, we have to work for it. Contrast these two sentences, the one from Niebuhr, the other from F. D. Maurice:

> 'A Christian apologetic which validates the suprarational affirmations of meaning by proving them to be the source of meaning for

* *Christian Realism and Political Problems,* by Reinhold Niebuhr. (Faber, 1955; 12/6).

the seeming contradictions and antinomies of life runs through the whole of Scripture' (Niebuhr, p. 174).

'We ask no evidence of Scripture but this, that it shall teach us how to think calmly and hopefully of events which would of themselves drive us to madness and despair. And that petition the Bible does not refuse' (*The Prayer Book and the Lord's Prayer*) (Maurice, p. 106).

Both men, I imagine, are grappling with the same truth; yet there is a difference in their utterance. A sentence like the first, though not occurring on every page, remains an occasional hazard which the reader of these essays must expect. Moreover, although the world, so to speak, is his parish, it is the U.S.A. which lies on Dr. Niebuhr's doostep, and the European reader must be prepared to look at himself and his institutions from 'over there.' Thus there are as many enlightened insights into our political traditions in the essay on *The Foreign Policy of American Conservatism and Liberalism* as there are in *The Anomaly of European Socialism;* yet in both one wonders whether the author has not been left behind a little by the subtle changes steadily overtaking British political parties.

Thus, on p. 54: 'Modern conservatism holds that justice is the inevitable fruit of a free play of economic forces, but fails to recognize that, since these forces are never actually equally balanced, the disproportions of power actually result in grave injustice.'

One would have thought that, whatever may be true still in America, up-to-date conservatism in Britain has recognized precisely this very fallacy, and by continuing in the tradition of social legislation laid down over the last fifty years, accepts the duty of eliminating some at least of the disproportions of power. Conversely, British socialism, at any rate in its present right wing, is turning more and more away from the blue-print of doctrinaire politics, and is accepting both the virtue of 'historic change' and the political duty of pursuing what is *possible,* and what the fact of sin renders *necessary,* rather than what is theoretically laid down. Responsibility of office is a great teacher. No doubt Dr. Niebuhr is aware of this cross-pollination in British politics; perhaps his own writings have helped to bring it about; but there are sentences in these two essays which, in isolation, appear to treat the strains as pure and still true to type.

The range of the essays is wide; but they have a common theme in their assault on utopianism, whether political or scientific or professedly religious, or wherever else it lurks. The method is in each the same—to expose the presuppositions upon which these cloudy edifices rest, the scientific in *Faith and the Empirical Method in Modern Realism* and *Ideology and the Scientific Method,* the political in *The Illusion of World Government* and *Why is Communism so Evil?* and the sentimental in *The Christian Witness in the Social and National Order, Augustine's Political Realism* and *Love and Law in Protestantism and Catholicism.* Here is a specimen from the last:

'A good deal of modern Christian teaching about Christian love may be . . . very loveless, for the preacher chides his congregation endlessly for not meeting the utmost possibilities of the law of love, such as sacrifice, forgiveness and uncalculated freedom from self, as if these were simple possibilities of the will. Thus the law of love becomes the occasion for loveless castigation . . .' (p. 145).

If some of us on this side of the Atlantic have been already warned against this particular aberration, as for instance by Dr. A. R. Vidler's *Christ's Strange Work,* none of us could come through a reading of *The*

Christian Witness in the Social and National Order unscathed. This essay is in quality above all the rest; its prose is loftier, for it was first written to be read aloud; eschewing the sociologist's jargon, it strikes with the merciless artillery of the simple sentence:

> 'Perhaps our generation will fail. Perhaps we lack the humility and charity for the task. There are ominous signs of our possible and even probable failure. There is the promise of a new life for men and nations in the Gospel; but there is no guarantee of historic success. There is no way of transmuting the Christian Gospel into a system of historical optimism. The final victory over man's disorder is God's and not ours; but we do have responsibility for proximate victories' (p. 111).

This address is reproduced, I suppose, to encourage the preacher through the other more tortuous essays in the book, to make him follow arguments through to their conclusions, to be fired by them, to clothe them in ideas of his own. It is a model for such work.

G. R. DUNSTAN

THE RELIGION OF 'JANUS'

Wilson Harris, the distinguished editor of the *Spectator,* who represented the University of Cambridge in Parliament until a Labour Government expelled the University representatives from the House of Commons, having completed in 1954 his autobiography *Life So Far,* has now passed hence.[1]

For Modernists the most interesting chapter in this interesting book deals with his religion. Two Christian denominations possessed his loyalty, the Friends and the Church of England. In the latter, Sunday by Sunday he read the lessons in his parish church. This interdenominational temper of mind which some of our Anglicans regard as the worst form of sectarianism is becoming increasingly common in urban centres notwithstanding the 'tightening up' endeavour of Anglo-Catholic parish priests. It is the outcome of the demand of the modern liberated personality, rational, moral, spiritual. This liberated personality desires fellowship but it must be free fellowship; it desires knowledge but it claims the right to decide what in that sphere it will accept and what reject. This is no profane novelty. It is as old as the Christian Religion itself and it was basic in the right of private judgement re-affirmed in the English Reformation. Wilson Harris writes:

> 'I cannot recognize anyone's title to impose beliefs or observances or even lines of conduct on me. If God exists my access to Him must be direct, not by way of any human intermediary at all, supremely valuable though human companionship in pilgrimage and human encouragement and human interpretation of divine things may be. "The Church teaches . . . " It does, but even the Church is fallible. "Do ye not yet understand?" That sad question was asked of the founders of the Church. Of course I am myself a hundred times more fallible. But I must turn for guidance not to another fallible, but to the One Infallible.
>
> I have spoken of forms of worship. The two I know best are those of the Society of Friends and the Church of England . . .
>
> It must be recognized that to the average man the beauty and order of an Anglican service appeals where the almost exaggerated simplicity of a Friends' Meeting would repel' (p. 317).

[1] *Life So Far,* by Wilson Harris (Jonathan Cape, 1954).

In the non-sacramental, not anti-sacramental, character of his religion Wilson Harris is all so English. There is religious loss in this non-sacramental attitude but it is developed by the Church's insistence on the compulsory necessity of sacramental religion together with the out-of-date character both in phraseology and in doctrine of its Occasional Offices. The Church needs to pay much more attention to the modernisation of these services and making provision for alternative forms of them. The sacramental element can and does provide a very valuable factor in Christian worship and religious education. Of the inescapable end of our mortal life Wilson Harris writes:

> 'It is not easy to determine in what spirit to contemplate death . . . On the whole I would rather say, Take care of life and death will take care of itself. I find in two poems of Whittier, "My Psalm" and "At Last," very much of what I feel about the end. It is in the spirit that finds expression there that I would wish to meet whatever may befall me "after all".'

> 'Thou who hast made my home of life so pleasant,
> Leave not its tenant when its walls decay;
> O Love Divine, O helper ever present,
> Be Thou my strength and stay.'

THE CLAIMS OF JESUS*

The desire is often expressed for a book which will present within a reasonable compass a summary of what is known of the life and ministry of our Lord, taking into account the critical methods, attitudes, and resultant views of reasonable scholars. Professor Turner has attempted such a book in *Jesus Master and Lord.* The result is a very useful compendium of knowledge for a theological student of the present time. Wide reading and a deep devotion inform the treatment of the material, and the reader can turn again and again to the work for information on the sources and interpretations of the life and person of our Lord. The approach is conservative, but it is a conservatism which will make a very good starting-point for a change to a more exciting interpretation. As will be clear from what is said below, Professor Turner looks at the gospels primarily as histories, rather than as works falling under no category which would include any other known books. Such an attitude is illustrated by an indifference to apparent minutiæ, such as the confusion of the two men at the empty tomb in *St. Luke* with two angels (pp. 356 and 359): these men have reappeared from the Transfiguration and will recur at the Ascension, and must surely be Moses and Elijah. Throughout this discussion of the resurrection, St. Luke is over-estimated as a historian and correspondingly under-estimated as a theologian. But such limitations are perhaps inevitable in a book written for the purpose which has been described.

It is perhaps not very well--known among the educated but not theologically specialist public, that the very attempt to write such a book may meet with fierce criticism, directed less against the author's presentation and conclusions than against the assumption that such a book can be written; for among students of theology it has been impossible since the Form Critics to ignore the view that all in the gospels is interpreted history, or even mere

* *Jesus Master and Lord*, by H. E. W. Turner (A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 1953; 21/-). *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus*, by Reginald H. Fuller. Studies in Biblical Theology No. 12 (S.C.M. Press, 1954; 8/-). *The Names of Jesus*, by Vincent Taylor (Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1953; 12/6).

interpretation of a religious experience. Professor Turner gives a full account of this problem in Part II of his book ('Can we reconstruct the ministry of Jesus from the gospels?'), chapter iii (the first part of Part II) explaining the difficulties and summarizing the recent history of criticism, and chapter iv attempting a brief historical reconstruction of the Life of Christ.

Chapter iii provides a summary of the issues most valuable to students, and the author asks the fundamental question on p. 87: 'Does St. Mark read into the material what is not there, or does he spell out what is in fact there waiting to be elicited?' It is this question which Professor Fuller has asked with great acuteness in his book, in which he accepts specifically the challenge of Bultmann:

> 'To believe that Jesus of Nazareth and his fate are the saving act of God in history involves a particular interpretation of a particular track of history . . . was that history such as to demand that interpretation? More than that, did the chief actor in them give those events a different interpretation from that which the early Church subsequently gave them? If the answer to this last question be in the affirmative, it will follow that the Church knew better than Jesus himself the meaning of what he was doing, and if that be so, there will be no limit to the "decisions of faith" which it will be entitled to ask from us' (p. 15).

Towards the end of the book Professor Fuller writes:

> 'We have not demonstrated the ultimate truth of the *kerygma*. That, as we saw at the outset, is not the task of the historian. But we have, we may hope, performed the humble preliminary task of showing that the Church's *kerygma* is not an arbitrary interpretation imposed upon an arbitrarily selected stretch of history, but that it has an intelligible basis in that history, and in the mind of the chief participator in it. Whether the Church's *kerygma* is ultimately true, however, is still a matter for the hearer of that *kerygma* to decide (p. 117).

Professor Turner would agree with the affirmations expressed here, but his attitude is nevertheless different in an essential respect: for him the *kerygma* is factual:

> 'The distinctive feature of the Christian message was not merely that salvation depended upon a particular historical character (that is wholly true), but also upon the belief that this historical character was Risen, Ascended, Glorified, and universally available to His people' (p. 78).

And later, when writing of Jesus the Messiah and showing that

> 'the Gospels are the first documents consciously to link the pattern of Messiahship with the Servant of the Lord who suffers and is glorified' [he asks], 'But does this identification go back to Jesus Himself or is it part of the work of interpretation introduced by the Evangelists themselves? Even if it were the latter, it would still leave open the possibility that it was nevertheless true interpretation' (p. 207).

What can 'true' mean here? Only that Jesus *was* the Messiah in the sense of the Suffering Servant; but this could be accepted by an unbeliever, who then might add that to be the Messiah in this or any other sense is to be nothing more than the apparent fulfilment of human hopes and aspirations. There is no guarantee that Jesus is the Son of God in the fact that he actually claimed what the gospels represent him to have claimed. Of course Professor Turner would not dispute this, but in his historical reconstruction he gives the strong impression that he is using the gospel material as though the historicity of certain parts selected by criticism can be accepted, and the

validity of the gospels' claims guaranteed by that historicity. For him—in this part of his work—it is a matter of choosing the historical from among the material presented rather than a matter—as it is elsewhere in his book—of an enquiry into what produced this material. A glance at his reconstruction will make this clear: the Virginal Conception is accepted as historical (p.95) but 'We hear of four "brethren" and of "sisters", though it is not quite clear how we should express their relationship to our Lord.' We may object that it is clear—or rather that there is no ground whatever for making it obscure—to a reader of *Mk.* vi, 1-6. Again, somewhat surprisingly, the Lucan account of the kinship between the Baptist and Jesus is accepted, but the Lucan travel narrative, for example, is excluded. Once more, the trial before Herod Antipas is accepted as historical, but no attempt made to explain the position of Barabbas in the Passion Narrative.

This eclectic conservatism reads oddly by the side of the author's discussion in ch. viii (Jesus the Son of the Father) in which he convincingly argues that the Hebrews 'show a considerable advance from' the 'crude conception of physical paternity' of a god towards his people. 'Israel is rather the adoptive than the natural son of Jahveh' (p. 219). On the next page Professor Turner proceeds to draw out the significance of this background with the words, 'In the use of the word "Father" to express a devotional attitude to God, Jesus and Judaism do not stand noticeably far apart' (p. 220), and he has already remarked (p. 95) that 'No early Christian preacher within the New Testament bases an appeal to believe in Jesus on the Virginal Conception' (*ibid*). 'No early Christian preacher' may well include the Lord himself, and while nothing is to be gained by a denial of the Virginal Conception, much will be gained by an assertion that the consciousness of Sonship which Jesus enjoyed is apparently based rather upon a sense of fulfilment of the categories in which his nation's best aspirations of the past were expressed. We may assert with Professor Turner that 'while the term "father" was not a new coinage on the part of our Lord, the use made of it by Him is individual and distinctive. It appears in the evidence which we have just set out that Jesus drew a clear distinction between the sense in which God is Father to Him personally and to the disciples corporately. Jesus always dissociates them from Himself in this matter. The outlook of the rest of the New Testament, that whereas Jesus is Son of God by nature, His disciples enjoy this status through Him by Adoption and Grace, seems to be clearly reflected in the use of the title "Father" in the Gospels. Here the Fourth Gospel does not introduce new distinctions; it merely accentuates distinctions which were already there in the Synoptic tradition' (p. 222); but we must guard against a misunderstanding here. When we say that 'Jesus is Son of God by nature' we must mean that he fulfils the conditions demanded by a title which can be understood only against its long historical background.

Dr. Vincent Taylor, in *The Names of Jesus,* supplies us with some of the information which we need to fill in this background: he lists and discusses at varying length forty-two names or titles used by contemporaries or near contemporaries of Jesus. This book is chiefly valuable as a work of reference: a chapter is liable to cut across a number of authorities each of whom uses the title in question in a different context, so that the treatment cannot be fully developed without describing more of each writer's thought than can be compressed into the space which the author has allowed himself. Thus, to take one example, it would have been more useful if 'The Way, and the Truth, and the Life' had been discussed in close connexion with the 'Power and Wisdom of God' rather than separated from this latter title by a note

on the Firstborn; for the first is a Johannine phrase and the *Wisdom of Prov.* viii, 22-31 surely has some connexion with the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel. It might seem ungracious to criticize the book on such a score, on the ground that full discussion of the names and titles was not the author's aim; but the book is in fact the First Series of the Speaker's Lectures at Oxford in 1951-52 and in some instances a title is fully discussed. Among these is that of 'The Lord', on which Dr. Taylor concludes that 'it is highly improbable that this title was in use in the lifetime of Jesus' (p. 43) although he also says (p. 51) 'We must agree with Rawlinson that "the cult of the Lord Jesus was inherent in Christianity from the beginning".' How far back may we take the beginning? Not before the resurrection, according to Dr. Taylor. Professor Fuller does not agree: he also discusses—and it is the heart of his book—the names and titles of Jesus and asks whether the use of the title, 'The Lord,' has any sanction in the mind of Jesus himself. Against Bousset's theory, revived by Bultmann, that the title was an innovation of the Hellenistic Churches, Fuller quotes the Aramaic liturgical formula *Marantha* (Lord, come) which no doubt arose on Palestinian soil, refers to *Acts* ii, 36 (where he believes the evidence for an Aramaic source is particularly strong), and to the primitiveness of the expression 'at the right hand of God,' clearly derived from *Ps.* cx, 1 (pp. 111–112). It still remains true that the *logion Lk.* vi, 46 = *Mt.* vii, 21 is the only good evidence for Jesus being addressed as Lord in the sense implied by *Maran* in his lifetime, and this evidence is not conclusive. Professor Turner may therefore well be right to come to the same conclusion as Dr. Vincent Taylor on this point, thinking that the use of the title in the gospels of 'the Incanrnate Life of the Master might represent a simple and pardonable anachronism' (p. 228).

On other titles Professor Fuller is more convincing: that of 'Son of God' is relevant to an understanding of the Baptism and Transfiguration, two events whose naratives cannot, as the author rightly argues, be forced into the categories of the Form Critics, and so be regarded as stories invented by the early Church; what they 'illustrate' can be illustrated by these stories alone. Indeed we may go further and insist that these events do not 'illustrate' at all; they are *sui generis* and convey meaning which no other events could convey, and meanings inseparable from the events themselves.

In the course of his argument that the conception of the 'Son of God' was operative in the life and mind of Jesus, Professor Fuller claims that the title at the Baptism has for background *Is.* xlii, 1 rather than *Ps.* ii, 7. These are surely not necessarily exclusive: the king of the psalm also might suffer ritual humiliation and Professor Turner writes truly, 'The voice . . . combines the Coronation of the Messiah with the Ordination of the Servant' (p. 209). Professor Fuller continues with the claim that the sonship of the Temptations is based on that of Israel in the wilderness; there is thus a connexion between the Son of God and the Servant. The author sums up what he has to say on this all-important title in very judicious words:

> '. . . while Jesus did not "claim" to be the Son of God, his words presume the knowledge that he was the Son of God in the sense that he existed in a unique relationship with the Father which found its pattern in the Sonship of Israel in the Old Testament, and which therefore was expressed in terms of choice and care on the one hand, and of obedience on the other. Moreover, this obedience was to find its expression quite concretely in the fulfilment of the role of the Isaianic Servant, so that the proclamation, signs and passion should become the historical media in and through which the eschatological act of God was to be accomplished in history' (p. 95).

This judgement seems to be as sound as it is excellently expressed. The 'claim' that Jesus was the Son of God is made not by Jesus but by Christians; and they make it not because he made it but because for them he is the Son of God.

Both Professor Turner and Professor Fuller hold that Jesus himself used the title, Son of Man, to express a truth about himself in relation to God, to his fellow-men, and to the Kingdom both as potentially present and as future. The title, according to Professor Turner, 'interprets the claim to be Messiah both in terms of the supernatural heavenly being of the apocalyptic tradition and of the Suffering Servant of prophecy' (p. 205); Professor Fuller's view is not far from this although he would not regard the Servant and the Son of Man as fused into one figure, but, relating the significance of the title to the coming of the Kingdom, points to the two periods of the Lord's activity.

> 'First, there is the period of earthly obedience and suffering, which he conceives in the language of the Servant, and the future period, in which the Kingdom will have come, and which he expresses in terms of the Son of Man. The dividing point between them is the cross, which is as decisive for his person as it is for the Kingdom' (p.107).

The two writers agree that the Messiahship is not central to Jesus' thought about himself, though Turner believes that what was central was the recognition by Jesus that he and his contemporaries were at cross-purposes in their understanding of the conception of Messiahship. Fuller has also something more original to offer, without disagreeing with this judgment: the historicity of Jesus' claim before the high-priest is strongly supported by the fact that he was condemned to death as a Messianic pretender, but it should be noted that this claim 'goes beyond the reserve of Cæsarea Philippi . . . since he is already standing in the context of his Passion, and there is no longer any chance of the claim being misunderstood. Moreover, Jesus at once goes on to qualify his acceptance of the title. The *kai* with which he introduces this qualification is, I suggest, the adversative Semitic *we*: "I am, but (in the sense that) ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven"' (p. 111). This is interesting, but we can hardly agree that there is no longer any chance of the claim being misunderstood: it might have been taken as confidence in divine intervention, and this is perhaps anticipated in the reader's mind by *Mt.* xxvi, 53. Again, the mockery both by the soldiers and the priests during the Lord's Passion turns on the fact that this suffering would not have befallen Jesus if he had really been the Messiah. They certainly have not grasped that Jesus meant 'Yes, but a suffering Messiah.' But if there was a chance of misunderstanding at that moment, we must agree with Professor Fuller's verdict, that 'the apostolic proclamation is in perfect harmony with, and has its sanction in, the mind of the Jesus of History, when it declares that it was at his exaltation that Jesus was "made *Christos*" (Acts ii, 36). For it was not until after the exaltation, not until after the decisive event of the Passion and death, that Jesus could be said to have entered on the functions of the Christos. By his history he had filled the term with a unique, specifically "Christian" content' (p. 111).

The Mission and Achievement of Jesus is an acute answer to Bultmann's challenge, which Professor Fuller is well qualified both to describe and to take up. In meeting this need he cannot be said to have written a book for the enquiring layman, unless the latter is unusual enough to read Greek, but his general argument is clear enough: as we have seen, it is that the

categories under which Jesus is described and presented to the world are those intelligible to, but sometimes misinterpreted or given a particular interpretation by, Jesus' contemporaries or reporters of the next generation. The substance of his own interpretations can be glimpsed fairly clearly on the background of his—and his nation's—heritage. This is as near as we can get to 'plain' history. The *kerymga,* Professor Fuller insists, is not an arbitrary interpretation. We are left asking if it is valid, and can agree that this 'is still a matter for the hearer of that *kerygma* to decide' (p. 117). This approach might be dismissed as merely that now fashionable in theology, although admittedly an approach curiously well suited to meet the challenge of Bultmann; but it seems in any case more satisfactory than that of Professor Turner, who stops far short of regarding the *kerymga* as all interpretation, and as we have seen, seeks to reconstruct a life of Christ as though his materials were ready to his hand. In this reconstruction he is like a builder who believes that the correctly-shaped house may be fashioned by taking materials from a number of rooms of an existing house and building one easier to live in. Our response is bound to be that 'the old is better.' In the old, some of the rooms may have shapes which render others dark, but we are best occupied in making a thoughtful pilgrimage through them as they are, believing that if the builders have here and there set the plan awry, the whole contains the living spirit of the architect.

ROBERT LEANEY.

A PERSONAL SAGA*

Anyone attending the Conference of Modern Churchmen in the 20's and 30's was certain to meet soon the Rev. F. S. Horan, parson and schoolmaster, a man always on the move who had done and seen many things and had many friends. In his book of reminiscences *From the Crack of the Pistol* he has told us what the M.C. Conferences have meant to him:

> 'I joined the Modern Churchmen's Union in the nineteen-twenties, am a keen member, and devour its quarterly publication *The Modern Churchman* with avidity, and could wish that every parson did likewise. The Editor has long been a valued friend—his writings have been as a light unto my path for years. In the hurly-burly of life, clashing creeds, mystifying dogmas and doctrines, Christian Modernism came to me as a clarifying, saving force for which I never cease to thank God' (p. 209).

The Modern Churchmen's Union has been one interest in his life. He has had a great many others. He has called his book 'A Personal Saga.' The number of different things he has done is extraordinary. Some parsons live in the same house and serve the same parish for twenty and thirty years, but the Rev. F. S. Horan has never stayed anywhere for more than five or six years; he is one of those quicksilver men who pass swiftly from one thing to another, do everything at speed and put themselves heart and soul into whatever they are doing. It is said that a good schoolmaster always goes up the stairs two or three at a time. The Rev. F. S. Horan was a notable runner at Cambridge —he won the Inter-Varsity Three Miles in the record time of 14 minutes, 45 seconds. He was President of the Cambridge University Athletic Club in 1895. His son Forbes was President nearly 40 years later, in 1932. Father and son sat next each other at the sports dinner. The title of a play was then on the hoardings, '*So Far and No Farther*'. The son, who had to make a speech, determined to use the words as a joke, but in the excitement of the moment he said by mistake, 'So far and no *further.*' The audience, however,

* From the *Crack of the Pistol,* by F. S. Horan (Longmans, Dorchester, 1955; 12/6).

grasped his intention and shouted 'Farther,' with roars of laughter (p. 215).

His adventures began early. His mother died when he was 8, his father when he was 10; he and his younger sister Daisy, without money, were brought up by friends of his parents, General and Mrs. Stileman.

> 'General Stileman—"Uncle William"—was "very overbearing, resembling in appearance General Booth, the founder of the Salvation Army, with a long beard and commanding presence. His word was law in all matters, religious and otherwise. . . . For Uncle William, my feelings were a mixture of affection and fear; fear predominating. On the human side he could be charming, full of kindness and fun. On the religious side he was a fanatic, fierce and hard as nails. The human side of Uncle William is what I like to remember now' (p. 19).

At the age of 12½ he went to Wellington and was there for six years. His Confirmation did not mean much to him, but through General Stileman's severe religious discipline he gained a lasting sense of God. The General believed that one was not really a Christian unless one had been converted, and had a 'date,' could name the place and time of his conversion. Horan began to be troubled at Wellington that he had no date. At last he got one, on December 2, 1888, at a Mission Service.

> 'That date has not the same terrific implication for me now that it had then. But when stirred to the depths at that Mission Service, I took those words of Our Lord home to *myself*, "Him that cometh unto ME, I will in no wise cast out." There was reality in it, and I think it served to give me an assured "start off" on the Christian "way"' (p. 22).

When he left Wellington, an opening was found for him on a tea plantation in Ceylon. He sailed from England in August 1889. But he did not stay there more than 18 months. This was the period of missions. George Grubb visited Ceylon in 1890, and Horan attended his meetings and was caught up in the general excitement. Grubb visited Ceylon a second time in 1891; he and his party were on their way to Australia and New Zealand; when he invited Horan to join their party, he threw up his tea planting and accepted.

It was an act of faith or folly, for he had no resources, and nothing to fall back on; he could not expect the Stilemans, who had children of their own, to start him on a career. But it turned out all right. For this was what decided him to offer himself for holy orders in the Church of England. Friends came forward and gave enough for him to go up to Cambridge. When he had taken his degree he became secretary to Boyd-Carpenter, Bishop of Ripon, while working for the examinations for deacon's and priest's orders.

He was ordained priest in Advent 1896. His saga tells how many different jobs he has carried through since then. Parish work in Liverpool and in the south of England, Naval Chaplain afloat and in Osborne Naval College.

His most influential and interesting work was done in conjunction with the Royal Navy. Admiral Sir John Fisher wished to see him appointed Chaplain to the Fleet, and the duties of that important official made much more pastoral and much less bureaucratic, as the following letter indicates:

> Admiralty, S.W.
> 12th April, 1906.
>
> 'My Dear Horan,
>
> I am running you for Chaplain of the Fleet. Don't go and say "*Nolo Episcopari*". . . I want to get the Chaplain of the Fleet on a new basis—

to have no office work, no looking after schools—turn all that over to the Director of Naval Education and let the Chaplain of the Fleet be the Chaplain of the Fleet . . . If my views are accepted, then he will be a *bona fide* Bishop instead of being an office clerk as he now is.

Yours sincerely,
(Signed) J. A. FISHER.'

The great man's vision was not realized but his project does credit to both parties.

Horan was naval chaplain on the 'Good Hope' which took 'Joe' and Mrs. Chamberlain to South Africa in 1902 on his important mission of reconciliation between Boers and British. (The war was just over.) When the ship stopped at Port Said some on board took the chance of seeing the Pyramids. Horan was one of them. Standing before the Great Pyramid he met 'Joe.' 'We are now, I think, in the very period of Joseph; isn't that so, Padre?' (p. 114).

For some time he lived at Windsor in a house facing the Castle, which he had rent free at the express wish of King George V, who knew of his work to Osborne. From Windsor he went, when his health recovered, to the charming village of Chilton Foliat, on the upper Kennet, near Ramsbury, in Wiltshire. Here he lived, as usual, a very busy life, carrying on his parish work with great energy and success, and also taking pupils. In 1926, he was settled in Swanage; he has remained in that neighbourhood ever since, engaged in parish work, and in teaching, and in doing many other things. He is now 85.

His book concludes appropriately:

'The last adventure still lies ahead, which Charles Kingsley said he looked forward to "with reverent curiosity." I feel the same, and trust to meet it with the thought given me so long ago at Cambridge by our old athletic trainer—"Pluck's the word".'

J. K. NETTLEFOLD

NEWS OF THE MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION

Much has happened since I was last able to write six months ago. A new pamphlet is now ready, by a member of the Council, Mr. John Wren Lewis, *Return to the Roots,* which is available from this office, price 1s. 6d. It is hoped that enough orders will be received to sell out quickly. The capital expended can then be used for further publications. Some of the better bookshops have taken a good number of copies for display on a sale-or-return basis at the usual trade terms. Personal visits to the management have been necessary in order to obtain this. It might help our publications if members of the Union in towns where there are good bookshops would approach them in the same way and would let us know the result. Copies ordered for this purpose will be despatched at once. Little by little we shall build up a system of contacts which should be valuable in the future.

Writing in the *Church of England Newspaper*, Dr. J. H. Oldham, the grand old man of the Ecumenical Movement, showed how Mr. Wren Lewis, who is a physicist and mathematician by profession, is in the tradition of thinkers such as Paul Tillich, Karl Heim, Martin Buber and John MacMurray and raises the question, What do we really mean by the word 'God?' Dr. Oldham adds: 'What gives special importance to his contribution is the sharpness and decisiveness of his challenge to the Church to revise fundamentally its ways of thinking.' In the *British Weekly,* Ilico (Dr. Nathaniel Micklem) in a long review under the heading 'A Scientist's Theology' describes the pamphlet as 'a stimulating and valuable statement.'

Great effort now is going into the Canon Law issue. A committee has been meeting, consisting of representatives of the A.E.G.M., the Church Society, St. Ann's House, Soho, the Truth and Faith Society and the Modern Churchmen's Union. To speed on the work, Canon Edward Carpenter, the Rev. John Drewett and I spent much time during the summer going through the proposed revisions of the Canons, clause by clause, and drawing up comments, criticisms and recommendations. In the form of printer's proofs these have been circulated to the committees of the organizations concerned. At the moment of writing, we are in the process of considering their reactions and deciding what the next step shall be. What is likely to hold us up is not lack of support, which is considerable, but lack of finance to advocate our cause. Several members of our own Council have sent generous subscriptions, and we have certain guarantees from elsewhere. But more is needed. With the experience in mind of working together with other organizations in the question of South India, we have good hope of being similarly successful with Canon Law. I have recently been touring some of the theological colleges of various schools of thought and have been surprised to find how much disquiet there is even among thinkers usually known as Anglo-Catholic about the new legalism being imposed upon the Church.

Turning to domestic affairs, at the annual general meeting, a motion was passed inaugurating a new 'family membership.' This means that in a household where one person is a full member of the Union paying the 15s. subscription and receiving the *Modern Churchman* other members of the same family may become members with all the rights and privileges of membership for 5s. a year but without receiving the *Modern Churchman.* By this means it is felt that many people, otherwise unable to do so, will wish to associate themselves with our work and increase our influence by

building up our numbers. In fact a number of people have already done this.

Branch meetings have either been held or are projected in the North-West, in Birmingham and in London. At Arnside, the energy of Mrs. Harrison sustains a flourishing group. Two excellent meetings have been held in Birmingham this year, one for members and their friends and one for the general public. The London meeting will be in a few days time. Lunch-time lectures are in full swing again at St. Margaret's, Lothbury, on Thursdays at 1.15 p.m.

Much encouragement is to be had from the very wide publicity the views of the Union are receiving in the secular Press. After the annual conference in July some 150 newspaper cuttings arrived from the agency. Scarcely a week passes without our being quoted somewhere and our statements go all round the world. People look to us more and more for comment on such events as directly involve religion and the Church. It is to be hoped that this will continue.

In the London Office we are most grateful for voluntary help from Miss Horwood who has been giving up two days a week to assist with administrative business. Another member, Mr. Brookfield, a New Zealand lawyer staying for some months in this country, has put in many hours work in the office. Mrs. C. O. Rhodes has kindly undertaken the sending out of reminders and receipts for subscriptions. Should anyone else living in or near London be willing to help in this way I am sure we could make use of their services. This voluntary work is tremendously valuable and I am sure I am right in expressing to those who have given it the thanks of the Union.

CLIFFORD O. RHODES

CORRESPONDENCE

THE DELUSION OF DISESTABLISHMENT

SIR

The demand for Disestablishment both in Press and Pulpit makes it desirable that those who stand for the influence of the Christian Religion in this country should emphasize the following points :

Disestablishment would not give the Church freedom. Parliament would not give the Church a blank cheque. The property of the Established Church would only be placed in the hands of the Disetablished Church subject to legal conditions ! If a bishop or parson broke these conditions, he would be liable to an action in the Civil Courts.

In 1841, many Ministers and Elders went out of the Church of Scotland to make the Church free. In 1904, the action of the Free Church Assembly was challenged in the Civil Courts and the Free Church leaders lost their case. So much for the freedom of disestablishment.

In the case of the Church of England, Parliament would certainly not hand over the cathedrals and ancient parish churches to the Anglo-Catholics. It would be insisted that other bodies as well as the Church of England should have the right to use these buildings also.

Who would rejoice at Disestablishment? (1) The R.C.s who would then claim that their Bishops had precedence of ours, and (2) All those opposed to religion in general and to Christianity in particular, who would declare Disestablishment to be the British repudiation of Christianity.

G. F. HANDEL ELVEY.

ERRATA

The *Modern Churchman*, XLV, No. 3, September 1955.

P. 223, l. 13, For 'Tradu' read 'Tradux.'
P. 224, l. 11, for 'choral garden' read 'closed garden.'
Note 26, For 'Ep. LX' read 'Ep LXIV.'
Note 36, For 'lapus' read lapsus.'
Notes 61 and 62 should be transposed.

W. H. C. FREND.

MORE ABOUT IGBOBI

Sir,

I was very interested to see the notice of Igbobi College in your June number. I visited the college in May and spent the first week of the summer term living on the compound. It was a most stimulating experience. Igbobi has the makings of a real Public School: there are now two hundred boys, aged about 12 to 18, and all but eight are now boarders. They come from all over Nigeria, though mostly from the Western Region. There is tremendous competition to get in, and there are hundreds of applicants for the few vacancies each year. The boys work hard and the record of successes in the Cambridge Locals last year was quite remarkable.

Why I write is this. When I was at the school Mr. Reginald Parker was left without a single European assistant, and (unless it has been remedied in the last few weeks) this position still continues. This seems to me a distressing fact, and a reflection on the Churches at home. Mr. Parker is grossly overworked: besides running the school, he teaches nearly all the Senior Science and Mathematics, and has to attend to countless matters for which in an English school there would be experienced assistants: to mention one example, even such a detail as blowing up the footballs! And all this in the temperature of Lagos.

May I appeal to you, sir, to try and help find one or more young English graduates who are practising Christians, though not narrowly sectarian, who can teach Science especially (though other subjects would be useful), who can coach games, and who can drive a car, to volunteer for a few years at Igbobi? I cannot imagine a more interesting job or one of more value for the Church and Commonwealth at this time. For the potential value of Igbobi for the whole future of Nigeria is difficult to over-estimate.

In your June number you mentioned the chapel, so I will add a word on this. In addition to his other work, Mr. Parker has been collecting money since he has been Principal and struggling with plans and estimates. Plans for a worthy chapel to cost about £11,000 are now, I believe, almost complete after many delays, and about three-quarters of this has, I believe, been given or promised. There is a hope that the foundation stone may be laid this year. Mr. Parker is no longer young and cannot go on many more years. I know he regards the school as quite incomplete without its chapel. May I appeal to readers of the *Modern Churchman* to help find the remaining quarter of the cost and make it possible for him to see the chapel in use before his retirement?

G. W. DAUGLISH

PHYSICAL AND SPIRITUAL

Sir,

In the March copy of the *Modern Churchman* I find an interesting article by D. L. Scott on Spiritualism which seems to me to contain two points of some importance.

While I can fully sympathize with the writer when he says that Christianity is concerned with knowledge of God through Jesus Christ rather than with

mere survival, I am bound to reject this line of argument, because it begs the whole question. For the possibility of further knowledge of God under terrestial conditions must depend rather too patently on the answer to the prior question, What is man?

That every human, or for that matter organic substance, is a great colony of independent cells, that this cellular structure is in turn composed of a vast assemblage of molecules, which in their turn form an almost infinite collection of atoms which, as De Broglie has pointed out, must ultimately be thought of as 'radiation plus grains of electricity', must clearly be accepted. Are there however any other constituent elements capable, for example, of interpenetrating the atomic and cellular structure of the human body, as do X-rays: and if so, are these elements capable of separation from those which form what we call the physical body?

If there are such elements, and if they can maintain a separate existence which includes consciousness or awareness, then they may well attain to a further knowledge of God. This no doubt is what the writer hopes for. But whether or no it is well based, must turn upon whether or no there is in fact an element capable of existence apart from the physical body. In so far as any evidence for this contention capable of bearing rigorous examination can be produced, so much the better: in so far as no evidence can be produced, the hope remains a hope.

So too with regard to the passage near the end, 'a material world transmuted to another plane'.

Let us assume that there is an element which can, as it were, hive off from the physical body, retain consciousness and make further progress in knowledge and experience. Immediately we are faced with the question as to where this element of consciousness will be. And to talk vaguely of spiritual values or of heaven being a condition rather than a place, is again to beg the question.

For as Mr. Fred Hoyle aptly comments in his book, *The Nature of the Universe*, just as mind in our present experience is closely linked with the physical body, so if mind can separate off from and survive the body, it must continue to have some connection with the physical world. For the Cosmos, including those galaxies which, because they recede more rapidly than light can travel, can never be seen from our solar system, is here. It exists even if it must all be resolved into radiation and electrical energy. And any constituent element which has separated from or loosened its connection with the other constituent elements in the Cosmos, such as the visible elements of the physical body, must still remain in and part of the Cosmos.

In other words, survival or spiritual awareness, if there be such things, must necessarily be the material upon another plane. They cannot be anything else: though it might perhaps be better to picture these conventional terms physical and spiritual as widely-spaced octaves on the keyboard of the Cosmos.

G. C. N. WEBB

The Parsonage,
Southwick,
Fareham, Hants

REPLY OF THE REV. D. L. SCOTT

Sir,

If our acceptance of Christianity is to wait until its truth can be proved scientifically, I am afraid that we shall have to wait a very long time. My answer to Mr. Webb's first point is that I believe the true answer to the question, What is man? is to be found in Jesus Christ and not in the laboratory. If we do not find the refutation of materialism in Him and in the lives

of those whom we call Christlike, I cannot think that we shall find it in the microscope or in the test tube.

With regard to his second point, surely it is Mr. Webb who begs the question when he says: 'As mind in our present experience is closely linked with the physical body, so . . . it must continue to have some connection with the physical world . . . In other words, survival or spiritual awareness, if there be such things, must necessarily be the material upon another plane.' Why *must* it be so? The body-mind relationship is still as mysterious as ever, and the confused and changing notions of astro-physics seem unlikely to throw much fresh light upon it. On the other hand, St. Paul's conception of a spiritual body is so illuminating just because it is poetic rather than scientific. Hence it does not become out of date.

D. L. Scott

THE EUCHARIST

Sir,

In his review of Professor Jeremias's book, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus,* in the June issue of *The Modern Churchman,* H.D.A.M. certainly placed his finger on an all-important spot when he wrote, 'But why did the author of the Fourth Gospel omit the Institution of the Eucharist from his account of the Last Supper and substitute for it the Washing of the Disciples' Feet?' And his pin-pointing of the author's statement, 'The accounts of the Last Supper, as we have them in the four Gospels to-day, are seen to be the outcome of a living process of *Growth in the tradition* (italics mine), is very helpful.

Upon those of us who share the Quaker view in regard to the Sacrament of Holy Communion is invariably placed the responsibility of explaining and *defending* our position; a position which is generally assumed to be *inferior* in its Christian content. But if the accounts of the Institution as contained in the Synoptic Gospels were based upon the statement of Paul in *I Corinthians,* xi—which in any case must have *preceded* them—(although H.D.A.M. did not mention this), then Paul's introductory words, 'I passed on to you *what I received from the Lord himself*' (Dr. Moffat's translation, italics mine), are of vital importance. For as Paul had not been a disciple of Jesus during the Master's lifetime, then it seems pretty certain that we are here dealing with a record of one of Paul's frequent 'visions,' and *not* a record of an historic *fact.*

And I would ask this question. Was the primitive 'breaking of bread' a blessing on and a consecration of *a common meal* shared together by the followers of Jesus, and felt by them to be shared too with the Master and Friend they had so dearly loved when He was with them in the flesh—or did it in doctrine and ritual bear any resemblance to the later Sacrament of the Eucharist with its emphasis on *atoning sacrifice?* And if not, then was this latter a part of *Paul's 'Gospel,'* probably borrowed by him from the pagan 'Mysteries?' I am sure that there must be many besides myself who would be grateful for any additional light that can be thrown upon this important question—and grateful, too, if the matter could be discussed without prejudice and with an open mind—an open mind which, I suggest with all courtesy, could and should be shared with advantage by our 'orthodox' critics.

Malcolm Rutt.

Reply to Mr. Rutt's Letter

[We venture to commend *Christus in Ecclesia,* by Dean Hastings Rashdall (T. T. Clark, 1904) as the best basic contribution to this theme with which we are acquainted and particularly the sermon *The Holy Eucharist,* preached in Lincoln's Inn—Ed., M.C.]